STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
main,stks 205Ev13
Lutheran quarterly.
v.30 1900 Lutheran quarterly
0 0001 00658532 5

CLASS 205 BOOK R974

VOLUME 30

PENNSYLVANIA
STATE LIBRARY

04-79-824-5

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

https://archive.org/details/vol30lutheranqua00luth

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

CONDUCTED BY

M. VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D. PHILIP M. BIKLE. PH. D.
JAMES W. RICHARD, D. D. THOMAS C. BILLHEIMER, D. D.

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

PRES. S. A. ORT., D. D., LL. D. PROF. F. D. ALTMAN, D. D.
PROF. ALFRED HILLER, D. D. PROF. JACOB YUTZY, D. D.

NEW SERIES—VOL. XXX.

GETTYSBURG:
THE J. E. WIBLE PRINTING HOUSE, CARLISLE STREET (SECOND SQUARE).
1900.

INDEX TO VOL. XXX.

Anstadt, Dr. P., Art. by, 228.
Asceticism, Its Place in Christian Conduct, 556.
Augsburg Confession and Luther, The, 29, 359, 463.
Bauslin, Dr. D. H., Arts. by, 103, 261, 425, 574.
Biblical Quotations in the New Testament and their Relation to Inspiration, 315.
Bowen, Dr. Edwin E., Art. by, 18.
Butler, Dr. J. G., Art. by, 61.
Camerarius, Melanchthon's Greek Letter to, June 16, 1525, 415.
City Pastorate, The Discouragements and Encouragements of a, 533.
Classics Once More, 18.
Conversion, Luthardt on, 145.
Coover, Rev. M., Art. by, 315.
Covenant People and their Part in the Promises, The, 518.
Current Theological Thought, 103, 261, 425, 574.
Discouragements and Encouragements, The, of a City Pastorate, 533.
Doctors, Jesus with the, 565.
Doctrine of Free Will, Melanchthon's, 190.
Dogmatic, Schmid's, 243.
Dolbeer, Rev. W. H., Art. by, 69.
Ethics of Herbert Spencer, 1.
Facing the Twentieth Century, 61.
Fatherhood of God, The, a Pentecostal Climax, 211.
Hay, Dr. Chas. E., Art. by, 145.
Hefelbower, Rev. S. Gring, Arts. by, 111, 243, 270, 435, 581.
Heisler, Dr. C. W., Art. by, 399.
Higher Criticism, 453.
Higher Education in the Twentieth Century, 399.
Infant Membership, 69.
Inspiration, The Lutheran Doctrine of, 88.
Japanese Home at New Year, In a, 82.
Jesus with the Doctors, 565.
Jesus, Moral Character of, 254.
King, Rev. Hiram, Art, by, 211.
Lambert, Rev. W. A., Art. by, 415.
Luthardt on Conversion, 145.
Luther and the Augsburg Confession, 29, 359, 463.
Materialism, 297.
Melanchthon's Doctrine of the Will, 190.
Melanchthon's Greek Letter to Camerarius, June 16, 1525, 415.
Modern Christian Evidence, A Chapter in, 504.
Moral Character of Jesus, The, 254.
Mormonism: Its History, Doctrines, Strength, Methods and Aims, 228.
Parson, Dr. W. E., Art. by, 326.
Peery, Rev. R. B., Arts. by, 82, 565.
Pentecostal Climax, a, The Fatherhood of God, 211.
Pew and Pulpit of To-day, 160.
Pollock, Rev. J. F., Art. by, 518.
Porch, Dr. F. M., Art. by, 533.
Power of His Resurrection, 173.
Review of Recent Literature, 118, 279, 446, 590.
Richard, Dr. J. W., Arts. by, 29, 359, 463.
Sacramentorum, De Usu, 326.
Sanders, Rev. C. F., Art. by. 504.
Schmid's Dogmatic, 243.
Schodde, Dr. Geo. H., Art. by, 453.
Seebach, Rev. Julius F., Art. by, 190.
Stork, T. B., Art. by, 1.
Stump, Rev. Adam, Art. by, 88.
Thomas, Dr. Cyrus, Art. by, 297.
Thomlinson, Rev. John, Art. by, 254.
Wenner, Dr. G. U., Art. by, 556.
Wynn, Dr. W. H., Art. by, 173.
Young, Dr. M. L., Art. by, 160.

13517

PENNSYLVANIA
STATE LIBRARY

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1900.

ARTICLE I.

THE ETHICS OF HERBERT SPENCER,

By T. B. Stork, A. M.

It is said that a picture of the great Apelles was once well criticized by a humble shoemaker who remarked in it an ill drawn shoe.

In like manner perhaps it may be permissible for us to pass in review the ethical system which the great Apostle of Evolution has so elaborately, so clearly—and shall we say also so prolixly?—developed in the Data of Ethics and its companion volumes.

Briefly summarized the system presents us with this test of right and wrong conduct: Agreeable sensations. Mr. Spencer says: "Using then as our tests those most pronounced forms of good and bad conduct we find it unquestionable that our ideas of their goodness or badness really originate from our consciousness of the certainty or probability that they will produce pleasure or pain somewhere."*

The term "agreeable and disagreeable sensations" is adopted here advisedly as the equivalent of the pleasure and pain which Mr. Spencer makes the test of conduct. Necessarily all the pleasure or pain, good or evil, with which he deals must be based on sensations agreeable or disagreeable. The river cannot rise higher than its source, and the system which starts with the conduct of an oyster or other animal and tests all conduct

*Principles of Ethics, Vol. I., D. Appleton & Co., 1897, p. 32.

by the pleasure or pain experienced by the animal creation from the lowest forms up to man himself, must mean by pleasure or pain that feeling directly or indirectly based on sensations received by the bodily organs, the eye, the ear, the palate, and so on and nothing else. It cannot for one moment be supposed that the distinguished author would be guilty, without notice, of a change of meaning in his terms at any point of the argument. Nor can it with any greater show of fairness be inferred that the pleasure or pain, of which he treats when dealing with the conduct of men and with egoistic and altruistic pleasures and their reconciliations, can possibly have any existence or reality except such as in the last analysis bases itself on agreeable sensations—the pleasures of and through the senses. No matter how silver or golden the head of his statue, it must stand, if it stand at all, on the feet of clay with which he started, agreeable sensations.

Take away agreeable sensations, destroy the organs of the senses, and the most sublimated of altruistic pleasures must perish; for it is only through sympathy and its concomitant, a representation of the agreeable sensations produced in one's own senses, that there is enjoyed the altruistic pleasure of beholding or knowing of the agreeable sensations of another.

The significance of the foregoing observations is made manifest when the author comes to treat of other systems of Ethics. Arguing that all ethical systems agree, that the justification for life turns on the issue whether pleasurable or painful feelings predominate, he proceeds to remark: "Changing the venue cannot alter the verdict. * * * And for either to regard animate existence as a blessing if here its pains were held to exceed its pleasures, he must hold that hereafter its pleasures will exc ed its pains * * * so implying that life is a blessing and not a curse we are inevitably asserting that conduct is good or bad according as its total effects are pleasurable or painful."*

That is to say, being interpreted, having started with the general proposition that conduct is good in an oyster or a man, which affords pleasurable feelings or sensations, we are now

*Principles of Ethics, Vol. I., D. Appleton & Co., 1897, p. 28.

asked to say that those ethical systems which make the pleasurable feelings to be enjoyed in the next world as the justification, for life in this, are practically on the same plane; and that the logical position of the man who says life can only be justified on the ground of good to be obtained in the next world is the same as that of the man who says life is only justified by the good to be obtained in this world. In other words that the good of the next world and the good of this world are identical: material good and spiritual good are the same things, or in a different form that there is no spiritual good as distinguished from material good.

We do not lose sight of the argument that no matter what the kind of good meant, spiritual or material, the fact remains that it is always some sort of good that is presented as the reason for and justification of life. So far the confusion of the two goods is not destructive of Mr. Spencer's reasoning. But it will be disputed by none that all ethical systems worthy of the name always present good of some sort as the object and reason for conduct. The real dispute is on this very matter, what kind of good, what sort of good, is presented, is it the material good of Mohamet's Paradise, the good of agreeable sensations, or is it the spiritual good of Christ's heavenly kingdom?

Here we have a confusion of the two goods that is inexcusable: in the first place it is inaccurate, for previously the discussion had been of agreeable sensations, from those of the oyster up, and the proposition was put forward that those agreeable sensations made conduct that tended to produce them good in animals and men. But when we come to deal with the good of the next world we are bound to take notice that in the passage thither, in death, so far as we know anything of it, all sensations agreeable or otherwise, must cease with the destruction of those bodily organs which alone are the instruments of sensation. Indeed before death it sometimes happens, through the partial death which we call decrepitude of the various organs, all sensation ceases, so that so far as we know anything we must know that agreeable sensations or feelings, the material pleasurable feelings of the body are impossible after death, the very organs

and whole body being destroyed and with them the sources of all these sensations. So that for this reason and on the basis of the scientific reasoning which Mr. Spencer himself puts forward the comparison of the two goods, that of this and that of the next world is, to say the very least, unjustifiable.

But again and logically it is inexcusable, because the systems antagonistic to his own to which he refers, expressly draws the distinction between the material and the spiritual good and contrast the two as opposite and not identical. This of course does not establish the distinction as real and true, but it certainly precludes Mr. Spencer from assuming that the identity of the two is conceded.

Changing the venue therefore does not alter the verdict. Indeed it may be said to bring the pleadings to the real issue, the vital dispute between the two great ethical systems, the Christian and the Spencerian.

The good which justifies conduct in the Christian system is one which is independent of agreeable sensations and of all material conditions. It is a state of consciousness variously and imperfectly described as peace with God, spiritual happiness, or blessedness, consciousness of Divine approval, and so on, but a state that has as its outward badge an independence of all physical conditions. Every other good known to man depends on these: this alone is superior to and even grows stronger under the spur of physical suffering. Were it not superfluous, innumerable instances might be cited: the deaths of the ancient martyrs, the daily lives of invalids, all attest the existence of this state of consciousness whose happiness is independent of physical conditions.

Nor is it any shadowy unsubstantial dream of the poet or philosopher, it is as positive and real and as capable of definition as any good of the other system. Like all other goods, whether based on agreeable sensations or otherwise, to know it, it must be experienced. The simplest agreeable sensation is indescribable to one who has not experienced it, the pleasure obtained from drinking a glass of cool water would be impossible of description without the aid of experience, save by the most

imperfect and most unsatisfactory circumlocution. Without the verification of experience its very existence might well be doubted.

In this respect the spiritual good of the Christian system stands on the same basis as the agreeable sensation of the Spencerian: both depend on experience for their ultimate demonstration, and independent of experience both are equally difficult of proof. When, however, we come to compare them further by the two tests to which every system of ethics must appeal, the superiority of the Christian system shines forth as the light of day to a flickering candle flame. These two tests are, first the certainty of the theoretical truth of the system, and secondly the certainty of its application to practical affairs, its ability to solve correctly and surely the problems of every day conduct.

And first, as to its theoretical truth the Christian system carries this high assurance. It calls to witness consciousness itsself. It is as conclusive as Des Cartes's *Cogito Ergo sum;* for it declares that to the man who follows the Christian precepts, regulates his conduct by Christ's teaching as embodied in these two rules, 'Love God and thy neighbor as thyself,' there will come the assurance that he is doing God's will, that his conduct is right absolutely without peradventure or shadow of doubt No man can doubt the assurance thus delivered by consciousness, for such doubt is suicidal, it is a contradiction in terms.

If it be objected that this assurance may be an error of delusion of the particular consciousness which experiences it, that such an assurance is merely subjective with possibly no objective reality corresponding to it, the answer is that the whole question of right and wrong is subjective and not objective in the aspect which we are now considering. There is no absolute right and wrong except that which concerns the individual and him alone. That assurance is given him as a guide as an individual, it does not, it cannot from its very nature, justify his conduct to others, but only to himself and to his Creator, to that Supreme Judge to whom it alone appeals.

Nor is the further objection relevant that often men appeal to

their assurance of God's approval as a justification for acts of the most widely different sort. The man who buries his mother alive under a sense of filial duty, the Hindoo mother who throws her child to the crocodile, the lunatic who considers it his religious duty to kill someone, all appeal apparently to the same assurance of God's approval as Florence Nightingale, Sister Dora or John Brown.

This objection, by its very irrelevancy, may serve to emphasize the difference between the goods proposed by these two opposing systems, as tests of conduct. The Spencerian system tests conduct by objective good and evil, good and evil measured by material results; and it would unhesitatingly condemn the conduct of the savage son and the Hindoo mother as morally bad because materially bad. If it posited such a thing as a hell it would undoubtedly be logically compelled to condemn both to it for their evil conduct. Not so the Christian system, it refuses to pass judgment upon these acts as good or evil without knowledge of the spiritual state of the actors. It declares that by that spiritual state alone is every act to be judged morally good or bad. This point needs further elaboration but the proper place for it will be when we come to study the practical application of the two systems to conduct. It is merely alluded to now as an answer to the objections to the Christian theory on the score of want of objective certainty and validity.

The Spencerian system on the other hand, as we have already seen, declares agreeable sensations the test of conduct. But at the very next step in the statement of the theory we are warned of the occasional invalidity of the test: "In many cases pleasures are not connected with actions which must be performed nor pains with actions which must be avoided but contrariwise."*

The reason of this is clearly set forth. It is the lack of adaptation of men to their environment that causes this disagreement of practice with theory; were it not for this lack of adaptation the truth would be recognized "that actions are completely right only when, besides being conducive to future happiness

*Page 99, Principles of Ethics.

special and general, they are immediately pleasurable, and that painfulness not only ultimate but proximate is the concomitant of actions which are wrong."*

Comparatively slight as this qualification of the rule may at first seem, a little examination will show its significance to be very great. For observe, the argument for the truth of the rule up to this point has been: Do that which will produce immediate agreeable sensations for you; for, observing the natural phenomena around us, you will see that this is the course of nature from the simplest animal up to man himself, the oyster absorbs nourishment because of the agreeable sensation experienced in so doing, and so up to man. And apart from observation we must know *a priori* that unless every act necessary to preserve life in animals and in man had been accompanied by agreeable sensations such acts would not have been performed and both animals and man would have perished for failure to eat, drink and sleep; hence it must be assumed on this *a priori* ground as well that all necessary acts were accompanied by agreeable sensations. Latent but essential to the validity of this reasoning lies the assumption that this natural phenomenon is right, that what we observe about us of the lives and growth of animals and their various acts up to man himself are right. To assume the converse would destroy the whole ratiocinative structure; if what we see taking place about us in nature is not right in every particular then the whole argument must fall; for if it be not right for the oyster to take nourishment and perform the other acts necessary for its existence it cannot be right for man, and the argument that because these necessary acts, assumed to be right because necessary, are followed by agreeable sensations, therefore all acts are right which are followed by agreeable sensations, must fall.

But now we are told that there are acts which must be performed, that is, acts which are right, which are not followed by agreeable sensations. But these necessary acts which are right and yet are not followed by agreeable sensations are as much a part of the phenomena of nature as those necessary and right

*Page 99, Principles of Ethics.

acts which are followed by agreeable sensations and we have as a result that some right acts are and some are not followed by agreeable sensations, or in other words it is not true that in nature all right acts are followed by agreeable sensations. Nor does the explanation that this is due to lack of adaptation of the animal or of man to his environment help the matter. Lack of adaptation leads us still farther afield; for it assumes that there is some state or condition to which the animal or man ought to adapt himself: moreover, lack of adaptation, a condition in which the living creature and his surroundings are unsuited to each other's requirements, is as much a part of natural phenomena as adaptation of the living creature to his environment, and as such on the ground of its existence as much entitled to be called right as the other. We have no warrant for saying of one condition that is right, that is a condition suitable to the living creature, and that is wrong, a condition unsuitable to the living creature, a lack of adaptation, unless we abandon the fundamental proposition that whatever we find in nature is right and undertake to discover what the right or ideal condition is to which natural phenomena ought to conform. And to accomplish this we must know whether the living creature is wrong and ought to change, to adapt himself to his environment, or whether the environment is wrong and ought to be adapted to the living creature.

The investigation upon which we must set out really involves the ultimate purpose of nature and of all created things. Once abandon the safe harbor—that whatever we find in nature is right, and attempt to discriminate between natural phenomena and there is no stopping place in our voyage. We launch out into a sea whose only limit is the ultimate purpose of the universe. Mr. Spencer recognizes this and with a courage worthy of his great task he undertakes to trace the evolution of all from the nebulous undifferentiated matter from which our world was made through living organism to man himself. He traces the tendency of nature from the one simple undifferentiated mass of matter to the many and highly differentiated. "So it is

as we ascend from savage to civilized and from the lowest among the civilized to the highest. The rythm of external actions required to maintain the rythm of internal actions becomes at once more complicated and more complete."* * *

Thus it is assumed as a legitimate deduction from natural phenomena that the tendency or progress of living creatures from the simple to the complex, from the savage to the civilized, is progress in the right direction and, therefore, that all that helps that progress is right and that which hinders it wrong. And thus it is that he finds the means of discriminating between what is right and what is wrong in natural phenomena.

Our next inquiry, therefore, is as to the grounds of this deduction that nature's progress is from the simple to the complex, from nebulous matter to definite masses and worlds, from animals of few and simple functions to those of many and highly differentiated functions. It is plainly true that there is such a progress indicated.

Taking nature in the large we think we can trace the formation of definite worlds from indefinite nebulous matter, and taking it in a more restricted way we think we have traced the progress of animal life from the simple cell to man, and taking it still more restrictedly we trace the growth of each animal from the egg to maturity and complexity. But we must also remember that to this progression there is a perfectly corresponding retrogression from the complex to the simple. If we behold planets rising from the sea of matter we also see them sinking back to it again; dead suns and dying planets and their fragments in the shape of "falling stars" as they are popularly called, fill the dark abysses of space. Integration and disintegration go side by side.

In the majority of living creatures the process of development from simplicity to complexity is never completed. Of all living creatures only a very small percentage ever reach full maturity and perfection of function, and of man himself, the most favored of all in this respect, perhaps not one half of those born attain

*Principles cited, page 73.

the full ripeness of their powers. The majority of living creatures are hurried with ghost-like rapidity across the stage of life undeveloped into the homogeneous earth. And the few which attain the maturity and perfection of their powers and the full complexity of function retain it for but a brief space when they pass first into decrepitude and finally into utter loss of all in death. Complexity and definiteness are lost for the most favored in the homogeneity of the common mass, the earth. Over all things living is written in unmistakable characters, "Dust to dust, ashes to ashes."

So far from declaring therefore that the rightful or true progress of nature is from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, from simplicity to complexity, a fairer statement would be that it is a perpetual swinging to and fro in a vast sea of matter, a perpetual becoming, as the Germans say, but never from it all any indication of whither its real movement tends. We behold nature progressing with perfect indifference from the complexity of the highest life to the simplicity of death and again out of death surging back to life in ceaseless tides. Unless we can discern in these the ultimate end or resting place it is as legitimate a deduction to fix upon death and the merging of the individual in the mass as life and the distinction of the individual from the mass as the true object or end of all.

It might still be argued that, conceding the ultimate end of all natural phenomena to be death, the merging of the heterogeneous and complex in the homogeneous and simple, yet that the rightful progress, the true path of nature to that ultimate end, is through the development and evolution of life from the simple to the complex. Or in other words, that we must assume that the progress of natural phenomena, no matter to what ultimate end it tends, is right *pro hac vice* just as the rise of the tide is right until it begins to fall, when its fall becomes right in turn. But this is simply a repetition in a more elaborate form of the original argument, that whatever is in nature is right. We simply take a little wider view of natural phenomena as we might of the tide, distinguishing possibly some contrary eddy in its rise as wrong and declaring its true course to be up and not

down. But then a still wider view might reveal the fact that this in turn is only an eddy in some much larger tide of nature so that we would be compelled finally either to go on to the ultimate purpose of all natural phenomena to find the real direction of its march, or we should have to fall back on the original proposition that it is all right in its turn, *pro hac vice;* because all movements, however infinitely minute, of the great onward march to the unknown end of all must be right.

To repeat the argument in a little different form, we have no proof afforded us by our study of phenomena that a civilized state is better or higher than a savage or that a more complex organism is higher than a less complex, that a man is a better animal than a particle of protoplasm, for we have no measure given us for the purpose by natural phenomena. It would be as reasonable to say that gold is better or higher than lead as to say that the complex is better or higher than the simple organism, or the civilized better or higher than the savage man. On the basis of natural phenomena all are alike. It is true we do consider gold better and higher than lead because it is more useful for accomplishing certain ends and purposes, but that is on the assumption that these ends and purposes are themselves desirable, and being so, thus render the gold desirable.

The very use of the words high and low or better and worse with reference to natural phenomena connote something apart from natural phenomena by which these characteristics may be measured.

High in what respect; better for what purpose; are the natural questions that arise upon such a statement. If the answer be high in regard to natural development or better for the purposes and ends of nature, we must know what natural development is, what the purposes and ends of nature are. The difficulty of ascertaining these has been pointed out. Even the assumption that it is a purpose or end of nature to foster life or to produce agreeable sensations for living creatures, finds little support in natural phenomena. Nature is supremely selfish and self-seeking, the preying of animals and even of plants upon each other, the fierce egoistic struggle for existence, may be

found illustrated in every act of nature's drama. The very life of many animals depends on the destruction of others. All nature is a contention, fierce, continuous, unrelenting, merciless. The principle of the greatest happiness of all or even of any one creature is found nowhere. Many animals destroy their own offspring; and of some fish ova, so little is life regarded, about .00001 per cent. only are developed into living creatures and even of these not all reach maturity.

We have tried to study the system on its abstract side, let us now take it up on its practical side as promulgating a rule of conduct and it will be seen that it leads its followers by a different path to the same unsatisfactory quagmire of doubt and uncertainty.

Do that which will yield the greatest amount of agreeable sensations to you immediately, is a plain and easy rule which is largely practiced by man without any thought of the profound philosophic sanction given it by Mr. Spencer. It is not hard to follow, it causes little hesitation or doubt to the simplest. The second or modified injunction, Do that which will ultimately yield the greatest amount of agreeable sensations, might well puzzle the subtlest thinker. Nothing short of Omniscience could guide the ethical disciple to an answer to such a problem; it is insoluble by human wit or human knowledge. It opens up vistas of eternity to mortal inquiry.

Nor does the practical corollary which is added give us any real aid: "Accumulated experiences have produced the consciousness that guidance by feelings which refer to remote and general results is usually more conducive to welfare than guidance by feelings to be immediately gratified."*

If we are to govern our conduct not by immediate but by "remote and general" agreeable sensations the question naturally arises, how far are we required to look forward to the "remote and general" agreeable sensations. Is our prospect to be confined within any limit of time or are we at liberty or required to look as far as possible even into the next world for the "remote and general" agreeable sensations which are to be our guide.

*Page 126, Principles already cited.

The "accumulated experiences" referred to cover a very small space of time compared to the life of the entire race and as they tell us nothing of the next world our knowledge from them is perforce confined to this. Conduct which might be conducive to "remote and general" agreeable sensations in this world might have just the contrary effect in the next. In truth there is a volume of high antiquity which more than hints at something of this sort, remarking in one place: "Thou in thy life time receivest thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things, but now he is comforted and thou art tormented."*

Such a possibility is sufficient to shake the scientific accuracy of the rule. But, even confining the operation of the rule to this world and its "experiences" the testimony of phenomena in its favor is by no means clear. Everything else being equal it is plain that a present good ought to have greater authority as a guide than that which is remote and contingent. Phenomena, so far as we know them as a guide, declare the present good superior and to be preferred, because present and sure, to the future, because future and contingent. How generally this doctrine is accepted by men in ordinary practice needs no exposition. And it is hard to see on any scientifically deduced principle any error in their logic; or how, on the basis expressly accepted by the system, future agreeable sensations can be shown to deserve as a guide the superiority declared, for even accepting the further principle that the conduct which produces the greatest amount of agreeable sensations in the long run is right, the popular belief expressed in the adage "a short life and a merry one" is not easily proved unsound. The man who indulges every appetite and gathers all the present—agreeable sensations—he possibly can, without regard to future agreeable sensations, and who exhausts them all and dies in consequence in his early youth may be argued with great show of probability to have enjoyed many more agreeable sensations than the so-called right living man who lives to three-score. First, his pleasures have been intense, while the right living man's have been largely, we must suppose, altruistic, and therefore much fainter, as all repre-

*Gospel of St. Luke, Chap. 16, v. 25.

sentative pleasures must be; the first man has passed from life before the decrepitude and misery of age has reached him and thus has escaped that debtor balance of suffering which nature exacts from all in greater or less degree in old age, he has made sure in a few years of agreeable sensations which the other has had to wait years for with all the uncertainty and possibility of loss that the waiting implies.

Stating the case as favorably as possible it must be admitted that the uncertainty as to the result reduces the scientific accuracy of the rule to a mere probability that possibly the corollary may be true. And the men who accepted the teaching that the conduct was right which produced ultimately the greatest amount of agreeable sensations might, without plainly transgressing it, ignore the corollary and proceed to gather as fast as possible, as large a crop as he could of present agreeable sensations.

So much for the theoretical truth of the Spencerian system. We now come to the certainty of the two as practical guides of conduct. Much of this has necessarily and unavoidably been discussed in treating of the theoretical truth of the two.

The chief difficulty of the Spencerian system in its application to conduct lies in its measurement of right and wrong conduct, not by the spiritual state or consciousness of the doer of an act but by the material results of the act. How strongly this difficulty pressed the distinguished author is apparent by his invention of the term "Ethics of Enmity"* and his remarks upon the committing of theft and arson, "injunctions which the religion of Enmity countenances—by the religion of Amity—condemned as crimes. Hate and destroy your fellow man is now the command and then the command is, love and aid your fellow man."†

It confesses its inadequacy and acknowledges that its rules fail altogether when applied to the conflicts of man with man or nation with nation in war. And even in peace and under normal conditions such as we find every day confronting us it admits that under its system absolute right and wrong are impos-

*Page 317, et passim.

†Page 135, Principles already cited.

sible to be known. "Instead of admitting that there is in every case a right and a wrong it may be contended that in multitudinous cases no right properly so called can be alleged but only a least wrong."*

Here lies the fundamental error of the system, namely, the making material well-being, *i. e.*, agreeable sensations, the only good known to man's consciousness, to the neglect of that spiritual well-being—the consciousness of God's approval. The failure to note this distinction is at the root of all the uncertainty which the Spencerian system exhibits in its practical application to conduct.

And yet the distinction between material and spiritual good is one drawn every day by the least philosophic. It is the recognized foundation of all those judgments in which men, while disapproving of outward acts as materially injurious and evil, pronounce the actors free from moral blame. In every war between Christian nations we know that good men fight and pray and die on both sides doing things diametrically opposite in their material consequences, yet popular opinion does not condemn as wrong the conduct of either although holding the most diverse opinions upon the material results of their respective conduct.

Some of the favorite cruces of the moral philosophers are based on the neglect of this same distinction. The question whether the duty of telling the truth would compel one to tell a would-be murderer or robber the road taken by his intended victim is a crux of this sort. The answer is simple: whatever course of conduct approves itself to your own consciousness of right so that you have that feeling of assurance of righteousness within you is right for you to pursue and one man might lie and another might tell the truth and the conduct of each would be spiritually right, however different the material result. In the same way it is conceivable that the theft and arson—which the Spencerian system confesses itself unable to practically deal with, save by inventing an independent system of ethics therefor—may be right conduct spiritually considered just as it was right

*Page 260.

for Abraham to make ready to commit the murder of his son Isaac, or for the disciples to commit the theft, as Prof. Huxley alleges, of the ass and the colt at the command of God. To the Christian system these cases present no difficulties, but to the Spencerian they are insoluble as already shown. In many cases the latter admits it has no positive answer, no sure guidance to give in the difficulties of life, except a guess, by its own confession, inadequate and uncertain. The Christian system is positive and peremptory; in no case however difficult does it give an uncertain reply to those who ask its guidance; it declares, do that which satisfies your own consciousness of right, regardless of all material consequences. This does not mean that material consequences are not to be considered, nor that there may not be many a struggle to decide what specific thing ought to be done, nor that the actor is to trust to impulse or feeling for guidance, but it means that the actor, having done his best to see what was right in the light of all the knowledge, spiritual and material, which he can bring to bear, and having honestly come to the belief that he ought to commit a certain act, that for him such act is right, without a shadow of doubt, and the material consequences, whether beneficial or otherwise, are in this spiritual aspect, of no importance. In this connection some further explanation may be proper regarding the true relation of spiritual to material good. That there is a relation between the two must be evident but like all those points where matter and spirit come into touch one with the other, the explanation is not easily made. Unconsciously we confuse the two and transfer the qualities of one to the other, and this is made especially easy by the fact that often, we might say generally, the two goods, spiritual and material coincide in their outward expression in conduct. The acts that confer material good, life, health, food, peace, content, are usually good in both senses, just as the acts that destroy material good, that injure health and life and property, are bad spiritually as well as materially. It is so easy to thus measure conduct by outward results, and the judgments thus arrived at are usually so correct that it is natural to feel surprise and some doubt when we find these exceptional cases

(some of which have been cited above) where the two do not coincide. What intensifies this feeling is the further discovery of the physical necessity of repressing by law many which lay claim to spiritual goodness as their warrant for existing. For example we forbid the throwing of children to crocodiles, the burying of mothers alive, in some countries the marrying of more than one wife, without regard to the spiritual good claimed by the actors for these acts. In so doing no judgment is passed on the subjective spiritual quality of the acts, but simply a physical conclusion is reached that for the existence and good of society such acts cannot be suffered, and the law is in its relation to spiritual good as impersonal as the attraction of gravitation.

In other words, spiritual good and evil are matters not within the knowledge of men except individually, each for himself, and not one for the other, so that judgment as to spiritual matters is impossible except for the guidance of individual conduct. It is this attempt to improperly apply to spiritual matters the kind of judgments which we are accustomed to pass in material physical matters that leads to the difficulty with which so many ethical systems struggle.

In all the history of the world there was never greater need than now for emphasizing this distinction between spiritual good and material good. This is the day of material well-being and physical comfort. Its conveniences and luxuries press upon us all with an abundance that is overwhelming. Nature is giving up to man's enjoyments secrets that had been buried since the creation.

No wonder that the belief should spread of the salvation of the world by physical means; that even the churches should say: Make a man physically comfortable and you will make him morally good. Feed the hungry and clothe the naked before you preach to them.

The Spencerian Ethics is the legitimate child of such an environment, and its method of treating conduct and law on the side of materialism is wonderfully enlightening and helpful, but

when it comes to reduce all goodness that man is capable of to a good dinner and a warm fire, for that is after all its final meaning, the epithet of Pig philosophy is not undeserved.

ARTICLE II.

THE CLASSICS ONCE MORE.

By Prof. Edwin W. Bowen, Ph. D.

Many attacks have been made of late upon the educative value of the classics. It seems to have become fashionable in some quarters to decry them and to make an effort, more or less successful, to dislodge them from the time-honored position they have held now for many centuries in the curricula of the schools and colleges. So pronounced in some places is this disparagement that it must give us pause.

It may not, therefore, be amiss for us to consider briefly, without attempting any exhaustive discussion of the subject, a few of the reasons that are urged by those modern educators who thus berate the classics. The more liberal of this class of educators advise that Latin and Greek be reduced to a very subordinate place in the curriculum, while the more radical, however, insist upon the elimination of these languages both from the high school and college curriculum and advise that French and German be substituted for them. Your extreme utilitarian who values most that education that insures the speediest fortune would go a step farther and exclude even French and German, substituting therefor, "a practical course." Fortunately for the cause of education these extremists are in the minority and their proposals carry little weight.

Numerous strictures have been made upon the educational methods of our country and the wisdom of our fathers challenged, and ourselves called antiquated, and chided for not keeping in touch with the demands of the times. And all this censure simply because we still cling to Latin and Greek and insist upon the retention of Latin, at least, in the college curriculum. I should like to say at the outset that in this discussion I do not

intend my remarks to apply to the professional and technical schools, but only to the college, which, since it offers a course in the liberal arts leading up to the Bachelor's degree, is, therefore, supposed to give a liberal education. This premised, let us proceed.

The chief point of attack upon our college curriculum is, as said above, the classics. It is claimed that it is useless to make a child study Latin and Greek for the reason that these are dead languages and will never be of any service to him when he becomes a man and has to go out into the world to make a living. Far better abolish these useless subjects, it is claimed, and substitute for them some of the sciences, which are practical and useful. Let us see if this reason that is urged against the classics is a valid argument, or whether it is specious. If this is a valid reason, we owe it to the youth of our land to cease to waste their valuable time in a useless study and to devise for them a system of education that will educate in the highest, broadest and noblest sense. We owe it, also, as a duty to ourselves as educators not to misguide the pupils entrusted to our tuition, nor allow them to burden their memories with mental rubbish, which possesses neither intrinsic nor disciplinary value, as is claimed to be true of the classics. The sarcastic reply Themistocles is reputed to have given the enthusiast who was descanting to him upon the advantages of a new art of memory must find a sympathetic endorsement by every youth of the present day, whose memory is burdened with the multitudinous forms of Greek and Latin, as the disparagers of classical education tell us. "Teach me rather to forget," said Themistocles. We appreciate the humor of the situation. But we maintain that a knowledge of Latin and Greek is not a useless knowledge that simply burdens the memory and is inflicted upon the submissive pupil, out of sheer perversity on the part of the teachers, to annoy him and make his young life miserable. On the contrary, the study of the classics is valuable, not only because of their disciplinary and cultural fitness, but also because of the light and help they afford us in the command and use of our vernacular language.

Every English-speaking man who has enjoyed the advantages of a classical education surely must feel that his study of Latin and Greek has been of incalculable benefit to him in acquiring a command and knowledge of his own speech. This can not be otherwise, since the vernacular contains so large an element of Latin and Greek words and has been so materially influenced by Latin in its growth and development. During the Anglo-Saxon period of our language, the formative period, so to say, Latin began to exert a marked influence upon English, as may be seen from a careful comparative study of the Latin translations of that day into the vernacular. Nowhere is this influence more notable in points of syntax than in the construction of the so-called nominative absolute, by some grammarians termed the objective absolute. (In Alfred's time the dative was the absolute case and remained so down to the modern English period, when the transition to the nominative occurred, Milton representing the transitional stage.) This locution has been shown conclusively to have been introduced into our tongue from the Latin through the translation of the ablative absolute construction.

The influence of Latin upon English in point of vocabulary is so obvious to every one who has looked into the matter, even in the most cursory manner, that attention need not be drawn to this phase of the subject. So great is this influence that no man who does not command a first-rate knowledge of Latin is capable of finding his way confidently through the labyrinthine maze of English orthography. But to him who possesses a fair acquaintance with Latin, how much clearer and more luminous does the intricate subject appear! So in regard to the meaning of many English words derived from the Latin language. Take the case of two lawyers, one of whom is acquainted with that tongue, the other not. How much more real, familiar and lucid does the legal terminology appear to the one who has a knowledge of Latin than to the other who has no acquaintance with that speech! Or if we take the profession of medicine, do we not find the same distinction to hold good? Yes, you say, but these are the learned professions. To be sure, I reply, and you

observe the advantage of a classical education here. Shall we not then suppose that the same is true of all professions into which skill and knowledge enter?

In the matter of style the advantage of a classical education is no less important and decided. Not that every man who writes forcefully and expresses himself tersely and accurately must first have spent his nights and days with the classic Latin or Greek authors, though in nine cases out of ten, every man who does so is familiar with the classics; nor, on the other hand, that every classical scholar is necessarily a good writer. But it is a significant fact that cannot be gainsaid that most of our stylists, with just few enough exceptions to prove the rule, have been those who were steeped in Greek or Latin literature or in both. Cardinal Newman, Matthew Arnold and John Ruskin—authors standing in the very front ranks of Victorian literature, stylists who are held up as models for our admiration and emulation—these were all three zealous classicists. I venture the statement that much of the wrong grammar and shocking choice of words which President Andrews, in his suggestive article on modern college education, in the September *Cosmopolitan*, complains of as being not the worst faults of many of our young doctors of philosophy and specialists, would be much improved if those same men had first taken a thorough classical course before entering upon their special work.

I am no *laudator temporis acti*, nor yet am I so blind an admirer of the present age as not to criticise whatever in it is inferior to the past, whatever is censurable. But I firmly believe that much of our mental confusion of the present day would be cleared up if, in our dubious eagerness for the new in the way of educational methods, as in everything else, we had not ruthlessly cut away from our old, established methods, the effectiveness of which has been proved for many centuries. The effective educational methods which have produced trained and sturdy minds in every profession, from the establishment of our civilization down to the present time, have not, because of a few changed conditions of life, suddenly become antiquated and effete.

The revolt from the classics in certain quarters proves the

existence of discontent with our present educational methods and of a desire to yield to the pressure of the times. The result has been the substitution of a multiplicity of subjects in the place of Latin and Greek, or their reduction to such a minimum that they have almost been crowded out of the curriculum. In some instances the sciences have been suggested as a suitable substitute, in others French and German. Let us notice for a moment these two classes of substitutions. And first the sciences.

No right-thinking man can object to the study of the sciences or to their inclusion in the curriculum. We should be as comprehensive and catholic in matters of education as in matters of taste, like the old farmer in the Self-Tormentor, who gave utterance to the immortal sentiment, *Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto.* It is but right and proper then that every one should be taught the sciences—biology, chemistry and physics. These are all legitimate subjects of study and should find a place in every college curriculum. But let us not in our very effort to be catholic and liberal become exclusive and narrow, and thus eliminate the classics to include the sciences. The study of the former will qualify us for the eager pursuit of the latter. Most of the sciences would prove less difficult for the pupil if his mind were first trained by the classical studies. I do not think that the pupil is prepared really to profit by the instruction of the scientific teacher till the powers of his youthful mind are fairly well developed. Now what means shall we use to bring about this desired development so as to enable the pupil at an early age to begin with profit the study of biology, chemistry and physics? The answer is the classics. Dr. Arnold of Rugby, than whom England has probably never produced a greater and more inspiring teacher, used to say: "The study of language seems to me as if it was given for the very purpose of forming the human mind in youth; and the Latin and Greek languages, in themselves so perfect, and at the same time freed from the inseparable difficulty which must attend any attempt to teach boys philology through the medium of their own spoken language, seem the very instruments by which this is to be effected."

And his biographer significantly adds that the conviction grew upon him that, after all, "it was not knowledge, but the means of gaining knowledge which he had to teach." In a word, the development of the mental powers is the object sought after in education, and no study offers a more effectual means to this end for the young mind than does the study of the classics.

The object of all the studies which we set the youth is to educate him, to develop his mental powers so that he may be qualified to grapple with any subject whatever it may be, that he may be fitted to solve the problems in life that present themselves for solution, no matter how difficult they may be. If this is true, then we should have in the curriculum *par excellence*, those studies which best develop the natural faculties of the mind, those subjects which lend themselves most readily to this end; and that the classics are the studies best adapted for this purpose, experience and time-honored practice have demonstrated conclusively. It follows, also, that the youth should be required to study not only what he likes, but even what he does not like. For life is varied and checked, made up of pleasant and unpleasant things. It frequently confronts us with distasteful and difficult situations, which we would fain evade if we could, but alas! we can not. We must meet them and solve them as best we can. Therefore, the mental training that does not teach us to surmount obstacles is radically defective. It is the part of education to teach us how to adjust ourselves to changed conditions of whatever character. This in rebuttal to the argument that a boy should be allowed some choice of study, and that if he does not elect to study the classics, he ought not to be required to waste his time upon a useless subject in which he takes no interest.

Let us, however, consider the second proposed substitution for the classics, viz., French and German. I am not one to discourage the study of those languages. To do so would be to argue myself grossly and lamentably ignorant of modern French and German scholarship. Germany is the country, above all others I should say, to which American scholarship, however supine, is profoundly indebted at once for its inspiration and for

its actual scholarly achievements. No advanced student, in whatever department of learning, can afford then to remain unacquainted with German, or with French either, for that matter. Indeed, a fair knowledge of these tongues is absolutely essential as one of the first qualifications for work, as well in the humanities as in the sciences. But while this is all true, it yet seems a glaring mistake, which ought not to be permitted to pass uncriticised, to regard these modern languages as equal to the classics in point of educational value, and, therefore, be allowed without protest to supplant them in the college curriculum. We ought not to acquiesce supinely in any such attempted change.

In the first place, French and German, being by no means so highly inflected languages as Latin and Greek, do not, for that very reason, train and develop the pupil's memory, his analytical faculty his reasoning powers, and, in a word, his mind so readily and so thoroughly as the classics do. Again, as we have seen, a knowledge of the classics is very helpful to a clear comprehension and a wide command of our own tongue, and is absolutely necessary to its complete mastery. But a man may speak German and French with marked accuracy and fluency, and yet his linguistic knowledge does not necessarily imply a good command of English, nor indeed does it insure a correct use of it, either with tongue or pen. This is merely another way of saying that French and German have not influenced English so much as Latin and Greek have. Though German is a cognate language with the English, and French furnished us in the Middle-English period with large additions to our vocabulary, yet because these are living and consequently changing languages, whereas the classics are dead and stereotyped, these facts serve to explain why a knowledge of the latter is more helpful to us in the command and use of our tongue than knowledge of the former. Furthermore, if we first acquire a knowledge of Latin, the work of studying French or any other descendant of the mother tongue, becomes far less arduous. French is, therefore, a comparatively easy language to learn if we are already conversant with Latin.

I said that a man might speak French and German fluently

and accurately. But this should be modified. I am transcending my prescribed limits in the discussion. I proposed to confine my remarks to the college curriculum and its work. Now, as a matter of fact, our college students are not linguists. Very few of them are bilingual, fewer still trilingual. They hardly ever learn so to master either French or German, while at college, as to be able to speak the language. They learn these languages grammatically as a dead language, so that, after all, French and German, as practically studied at college, are reduced to the same level as Latin and Greek. Hence the argument in favor of the substitution of French and German for the classics from the point of view of utility, falls to the ground. Now if this is true, and experience and observation show that it is, what advantage is to be gained by the proposed substitution? Clearly none, since we do not study the languages as living tongues and consequently cannot speak them. But some one who has not experimental knowledge of the practice in our colleges may demur to this conclusion. Then I will give my own experience as a student, which is presumably that of the average collegian, at least in the South. I myself graduated in French and German at my college and, when I entered the Johns Hopkins University, passed the preliminary examination in reading in those languages and presented German as a subordinate subject when a candidate for the Doctor's degree. Yet I could not speak German, though I knew it historically in the various stages of its development, but only as a dead language. That is to say, in my study of German I had trained only my eye, not my ear, despite the exhortations of my professor to do both. The result was that when, after taking my degree, I went to Germany to pursue further my studies at the University of Leipzig, I was at first unable to express myself with any appreciable degree of ease to myself or even to my auditors. But after some practice I acquired some command over my rebellous organs of speech, and my tongue learned to utter what I intended to say. I might say incidentally that during those struggling days of mine I took something of a fiendish delight in the fruitless though heroic

efforts of certain of my German confreres to converse in English. The cause of my temporary embarrassment was that in my study of German I had trained my eye, but at the expense both of my ear and my tongue. So with those German students who had studied English. Such then are my experience and my observation, and I believe it is the common experience and observation of most of the professors and students in our colleges.

It is clear then that the argument in support of the substitution of French and German for the classics is not valid. The substitution can not be defended either on the ground of mental training or of utility.

It is not, however, claimed for the classics that they furnish the ideal or the sole mental discipline that the mind needs for its full development. French and German and other studies, including the sciences and philosophy, are also essential for a complete, well-rounded education. But the classics are doubtless entitled to a prominent place both for the intrinsic cultural value of their subject matter as well as for their disciplinary value. There are many teachers who do not share the views of one of our distinguished educators, recently expressed, in his strictures upon the worthlessness of classic mythology, the indecency of Virgil and so forth. There are likewise many who would not heartily subscribe to his views, subsequently expressed at a state teachers' meeting, that the state should provide food for the pupils of the public schools. Not that the supply of wholesome food at the public expense might not in itself be a good thing for the children that are to be educated. This is perhaps true. But there is the possibility of abuse of paternal government, and if bread is provided gratis, the parents may also demand public entertainment, the circus, to gratify the eye of the child; and then, if we, like the ancient Romans, had *panem et circenses*, what kind of citizens might we logically expect the children to become? The aim of education might be defeated.

There is some danger perhaps of cheapening education too much and of degrading it by reducing it to a mercenary basis. This were to vulgarize it. There seems already, in some quarters to be a tendency in this direction. Some of our colleges,

in their zeal to allow as much latitude as possible in the choice of subjects, have included in their curricula a great variety of subjects of study and in practice permit almost any kind of substitution. This of course is in the nature of a reaction from the old cast-iron curriculum. Some of our colleges, eager for numbers and yielding to a vulgar demand, have added a business course, while others, overstepping the legitimate bounds of a college, have added a law course or a preliminary medical course. This invasion by the college of the province of the professional or the technical school has led to such confusion that a college education no longer implies a distinct and definite classical training, but may mean almost anything or nothing. Professor Peck scarcely put the case too strongly when he said in his very thoughtful paper on education, in the July *Cosmopolitan*: "When we hear to-day that so-and-so is a university man, one never knows by reason of that fact alone whether this person is in reality a gentleman and a scholar, or whether he is only a sublimated type of tinker."

Abuse of the Bachelor's degree, therefore, has resulted as a concomitant of the bad practice on the part of some colleges combining professional training with general education. This degree no longer presupposes, necessarily, the general training and culture it once did. We ought to have a distinct line of demarcation separating the college proper from the professional school, and the existing hybrid college ought to be forced by public sentiment to take a decided stand, and ceasing to temporize, to become, once for all, either a professional school or a college. At present the hybrid college proves an incubus upon the cause of higher education and tends to lower the tone of the college and the professional school alike.

"It is in view of this gradual and yet rapid change," says Professor Mahaffy, in his address on modern education recently delivered, "that I am disposed to abandon the principles which I held in former years and declare myself the advocate of another theory. We used to believe that it was not only possible, but far better, to combine general education with special training—to insist that the professional student should qualify in

arts, and the artisan in general subjects. Early in this century such a combination was certainly a good thing; but now this effort of combining arts' degrees with special training seems to me to lead to the deterioration of both. There is growing up at our universities a large body of professional students who are coaxed to remain arts' students by all sorts of indulgences and remissions, so that what remains is no real general education, while at the same time their special training is hampered. What we want is a system of great technical colleges, as well as technical schools where we shall honestly undertake to teach boys their special business, and not pretend to give them an education in arts, or puff them up with sham titles of B. A. or M. A."

In conclusion, it may be noted. as has been intimated, that the multiplication of subjects in the college curriculum tends to foster superficiality, which is the bane of scholarship. The danger that threatens our education now is sciolism, which must be guarded against most strenuously. We cannot afford to teach our students to be superficial and thus defeat the very object of a college education and seriously impair the progress of higher education among us. "The first function, then,"—I quote from Professor Mahaffy's speech again—"is to afford a complete and thorough training, especially in those great subjects called useless by the vulgar, but which are the real salt of any higher education." Intension, not extension, should be the motto in education. This is the spirit that inspires and accomplishes all research work, all work the aim of which is the enlargement of the boundaries of human knowledge. This is the spirit, too, that should inspire us in the preparation and equipment of the minds of those committed to us for the successful accomplishment of so grand and noble a work.

Randolph-Macon College, Va.

ARTICLE III.

LUTHER AND THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

[CONTINUED FROM VOL. XXIX. P. 527.]

BY PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D.

THE CONFESSION IS NOT YET FINISHED.

Of the *exact* form of the Confession at this particular time, May 22nd, we have no information. We know this, however: The Confession is by no means finished, and both the civil counsellors and the theologians are steadily at work on it, for, May 28th, the Nurenberg legates write to their senate that "the Elector's counsellors and learned men are holding daily sessions over their Confession, and are changing and improving it, for the purpose of giving it such a form that it cannot be passed over, but must be heard."*

Three days later, May 31st, these same legates write: "The Saxon Confession is not yet finished. But the same articles as they have been composed in Latin, have been delivered to us. These, without the Preface and Conclusion, about which there is yet the greatest uncertainty, have been transcribed by Jerome Ebner's sons, and will be sent to you. The German, on which they are daily making improvements, we will obtain when it is finished, and we will send it to you."†

June 3d these legates write as follows: "We send you herewith a copy of the Saxon Confession in Latin. It has the Preface, but lacks an article or two at the end, and the Conclusion. On these the Saxon theologians are still engaged. So soon as it is finished it will be sent to you. Meanwhile have your learned men examine and consider it. So soon as the Confession is put into German it shall be laid before you."‡

It is evident from these letters that work on the Confession is

*C. R. II, 71.
†C. R. II, 78.
‡C. R. II, 83.

proceeding very slowly. There is yet lacking Article XX., Of Faith and Good Works, and perhaps Article XXI., Of the Worship of Saints, and the Conclusion,—in quantity about one third of the entire doctrinal part, and in importance a part second only to Article IV.

June 8th these legates write again: "The Saxon Confession of faith recently sent you was intended by us to be laid before your preachers and other counsellors for examination. Gladly would we have sent you the Appendix and Conclusion, but the Saxon theologians are not yet ready with these, [that is, Article XX, perhaps Article XXI., and the Epilogue, had not yet been composed.] We will persevere. According to the tenor of the instructions given us, you mean that in your affairs we should unite with the Elector and Margrave George, and that they and you should unite in this matter. But inasmuch as the Saxon Confession is to be presented in the form of a petition in the name of the Elector alone, it is our opinion that it will be necessary to consider whether you, in connection with the Saxon Confession, shall compose a Confession in your own name to be delivered to the Emperor, or whether together with Margrave George, you shall urge the Elector to prepare a Confession not alone in his own name, but in common, in his name, in that of Margrave George, and in yours, and in that of the Estates and cities which are taking part in this transaction. We await your instruction in this matter; and as regards speaking with Margrave George, I, Kress, have already spoken with the Margrave's chancellor on the subject. He says that his Master's preachers and learned men are also considering the subject, and that his Master perceives the same deficiency that we do, viz: that the Saxon Confession has been composed solely in the name of the Elector, and that he (the Margrave) regards it as advantageous to present it (the Confession) in common in the name of all the Princes and Estates who agree in the articles of faith, and adhere to his Grace and to the Elector."*

This letter shows that up to June 8th the Saxon Confession is still far from being completed; that it is still the *Saxon* Con-

*C. R. II., 88.

fession, and not the common confession of the evangelical Estates; that the Elector had not yet been asked to prepare a common confession; that concert of action had not even been agreed upon by the other evangelical Estates; that it is still a question whether the Nurenbergers shall not present a Confession of their own.

A COMMON CONFESSION PROPOSED.

But this letter of June 8th reveals the beginning of a movement to have all the Evangelicals unite in the preparation and presentation of a common confession. This thought seems to have been entertained at the very same time, but independently of each other, by the Nurenbergers and the officials of Margrave George. We wonder that the thought of united action, and of a common confession, had not manifested itself sooner. But there were difficulties in the way. Philip of Hesse showed strong sympathy with the doctrinal views of the Strassburgers and the Zwinglians.* Some of the evangelical princes and cities had brought, or sent, articles to Augsburg, and might not be immediately willing to abandon these; the Saxons were going on with the preparation of their own Confession, apparently without much concern about the other Evangelicals; the Elector was at the head of the Evangelical party, and it might look like

*For political, as well as for theological, reasons the Lutherans assembled at Augsburg were intensely hostile to the views of the Zwinglians. Agricola preached again and again at Augsburg against the Zwinglian view of the Lord's Supper, and called the Zwinglians *Geschriftstuermer*. Michael Heller defended the Zwinglian view. (See Jonas's *Briefwechsel* I., 151–2, also, *Politische Correspondenz der Stadt Strassburg im Zeitalter der Reformation*, pp. 444, *et seqq*, *passim*). Melanchthon and Brentz labored hard to turn the Landgrave from his Zwinglian views. (See their letters to him and his reply in C. R. II., 92–103.) Melanchthon even invoked the aid of Luther, C. R. II., 39, 59. But Luther did not write the Landgrave until June 20th, hence too late to influence him in his relation to the Augsburg Confession, for Knaake has shown (*Luther's Antheil*, p. 47) that this, and not May 20th (*De Wette* IV., 23), is the date of Luther's letter to the Landgrave. (See also Köstlin, *Martin Luther*, II., 216, 654, and Schirrmacher, *Briefe und Acten*, p. 489.) Dr. Krauth (*Conservative Reformation*, p. 227) has made a singular mistake in applying the passage in Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd: "There is need of your letters," to *George, Duke of Saxony," instead of to the Landgrave.

impertinence for the others to suggest a common confession to their superior. Moreover, at least in the earlier stage of the proceedings, the Elector did not favor coöperative effort, and had actually rebuked the suggestion.* Happily the obstacles that at first stood in the way of united action were removed by the consciousness of a common faith, and the sense of a common danger, so that at length perfect unity of confession was attained.

But it is due chiefly to the Nurenbergers that the Evangelicals assembled at Augsburg united in the presentation of a common confession. June 15th they write to their Senate as follows: "The Saxon Confession of Faith is finished in German. We send it to you. It does not yet have the Preface and the Conclusion. Philip Melanchthon has announced that he has not prepared these in German, as he thinks that the Preface and Conclusion may probably not be prepared in the name of the Elector alone, but in common in the name of all the united Lutheran Princes and Estates. In the German Articles, as you will see, he has already made a change. Where in the Latin it is stated that in Electoral Saxony, this or that is preached, or held, in the German he has omitted Electoral Saxony and has substituted a common word which refers to all the Estates. You will lay this plan before you preachers and counsellors, and report to us your conclusion. Also, inasmuch as the Preface and Conclusion are still held in abeyance, and as nothing has been said to the Margrave and to us, we think it would be well for us to speak with Margrave George, and then in his name and in yours, to make a suggestion to the Elector. We offer this for your further consideration, and await your decision, especially as to whether we shall present a Preface and Conclusion according to your conception, or shall request a confession in common words in the name of all the Princes and Estates, and shall send the same to you for further revision.

*To the request of the Nurenbergers for a copy of the "Apology," Chancellor Brück, after having spoken with the Elector on the subject, made answer as follows: "His Electoral Grace doesn't like many counsellors in this matter, for the devil, such were his words, would have the last word (wäre nachräthig) C. R. II., 53.

"The Article, Of Faith and Works, at the end, is finished in the German Confession, but not in the Latin, which we formerly sent you. We have requested this. Since the Article has not yet been composed in Latin, we could not yet send it (the Confession) to you in Latin. But we shall see that it shall be ready in about two days."*

From this letter we learn that on Wednesday, June 15th, the Saxon Confession still lacked the Preface and the Conclusion in both languages; that Article XX., Of Faith and Good Works, had not yet been composed in Latin; that the Confession was still called the *Saxon* Confession; that no suggestion had yet been made to the Elector about a Common Confession; and hence that it had not yet been agreed by the Princes and Estates to have a common confession; that the thought of unity of action in a common confession is confined to the Nurenbergers and to Margrave George, and that no conference of all the Evangelicals has yet been held to revise, to consider, to decide upon, and to adopt the Saxon Confession as the Common Confession. These things are all made plain to us by this official letter of the Nurenberg legates.

JUNE 15TH—19TH.

Such is the condition in which the Evangelical Princes and Estates find themselves in relation to the Saxon Confession and to each other, June 15th, the day on which the Emperor entered Augsburg. That the Princes and Estates were occupied during this entire day from five o'clock in the morning to eleven o'clock at night in quarreling with each other, in preparing to receive, in receiving and escorting the Emperor into the city, and the Evangelicals in awaiting his pleasure at court, is simply demonstrable.† That during the three following days they were en-

*C. R. II., 105.

†For the specific facts, see Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., 263; Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, pp. 54, 57, 59; Spalatin's *Annales*, p. 132; C. R. II., 106; Cyprian's *Historia*, *Beylagen*, VI., p. 66. It is evident that the Nurenberg legates wrote their letter of June 15th late in the day, for they say that the imperial commissioners strove long at the Rathhaus to settle the strife between the princes. C. R. II., 106.

tirely occupied with the *Corpus Christi* Festival, in resisting the Emperor's demand for the suppression of preaching, and in preparing *Bedenken*, is likewise demonstrable.* That any work was done on the Confession during the four days, June 15th—18th, there is not one iota of evidence. It is indeed demonstrable that the Evangelical Princes, Estates, counsellors, and theologians, were so fully and so strenuously occupied with other things during those four days that no time could possibly have remained to them for work on the Confession. In addition to these facts we know positively that work on the Confession was suspended, and that it was in danger of being abandoned.† Hence very properly does Engelhardt say: "Article XXI. was added after June 16th."‡ But on which day after that date it was added we have no *certain* means of knowing. We are now brought to Saturday evening, June 18th, when at seven o'clock the imperial proclamation forbidding preaching, is heralded through the streets of Augsburg.§ Sunday, June 19th, is measurably a day of rest. John Brentz writes a very long letter to his friend Isenmann, but does not allude to the Confession.

*For the particulars see C. R. II., 111; Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, p. 64 *et seqq.*, 482 *et seqq.*; Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., 268, 283, 290; Müller's *Historie*, p. 545; C. R. II., 117, 118. Melanchthon, writing of the demand for the suppression of preaching, says: "This matter was in dispute three entire days." C. R. II., 117, 118.

†See Schmidt's *Philip Melanchthon*, pp. 195–6; C. R. II., 112, 117, 118; XXVI., 209; Coelestin, *Historia*, I., 93; Maurenbrecker's *Geschichte der Katholischen Reformation*, 287, 409, 410; Kolde in *Real-Encyclopaedie*, II., 246. The original contemporaneous documents belonging to, and reporting, the actions and transactions of June 15th–18th, are so numerous, full and circumstantial as to enable us to say where the Evangelical Princes, their counsellors, and theologians were, and what they were doing, almost every hour of those four days; and yet in those documents the Confession is not once named; though Jonas writing to Luther on the 18th, after seven o'clock, P. M., says: Nos Deo dante in causa principali proxima 3d fa articulos offeremus. *Briefwechsel*, I., 160. Compare Schirrmacher, pp. 70, 71.

‡*Die innere Genesis und Zusammenhang der Marburger, Schwabacher und Torgauer Artikel, sowie der Augsburger Confession*, Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1865), p. 600. This paper, which extends from p. 515 to 629, is a classic on the subject of which it treats.

§Schirrmacher, p. 70; Spalatin's *Annales*, p. 133; C. R. II., 124; Jonas's *Briefwechsel*, I., p. 159.

Melanchthon writes a letter to each of his friends, Myconius, Luther, Menius and Camerarius. In three of these letters he does not even allude to the Confession. In the letter to Camerarius he says: "I did not doubt that our Apology would seem milder than the improbity of our adversaries deserves. Nevertheless I embraced those things which are principal in the case." It is very significant that he employs past tenses. The Nurenberg legates also write a letter on this day, June 19th, to their senate. In the afternoon of this day the Princes are summoned before the Emperor, listen to some instructions in regard to rank, have their differences *inter sese* settled, and are ordered to meet the Emperor the next morning at seven o'clock to open the Diet. This consumed the entire afternoon, as we learn from the account given by Coelestin—*die in vesperam vergente.**

Already on the morning of this day (June 19th), the Nurenberg legates had written: "Yesterday before breakfast your two latest letters were answered by us. Then we went first to our gracious lord, the Margrave, and afterwards to our gracious lord, the Elector. In both places we find that his Electoral, and his Princely, Grace, hears with pleasure that your Excellencies will unite with their Princely Graces. They also graciously declare that in this matter they will associate you with themselves, and will allow the affairs of his Electoral, and of his Princely, Grace, and of your Excellencies, to go together; and though Margrave George was clearer and franker with his answer and promise than the Saxon, yet we do not anticipate any failure on the part of the Saxon. * * * We also to the best of our ability heartily thanked the Elector for having granted us a copy of his Electoral Grace's Confession. Philip Melanchthon has announced that the matter will possibly not require such an elaborate treatment, but that it may be abridged and handled more briefly. But whatever shall be done, whether the former Confession shall be completed, or another one made, you shall be informed."†

This letter shows that the Nurenbergers are still pressing the matter of concerted action; that up to this time, June 19th, such

*Coelestin, *Historia* I., p. 102; Schirrmacher, p. 72.

†C. R. II., 112. Compare the letter of June 15th, p. 32 above.

contemplated action includes only the Nurenbergers, Margrave George and the Elector; that there is an element of uncertainty in the Elector, and hence that concert of action has not yet been agreed upon; that the Confession is still called "the Confession of his Electoral Grace," and hence has not become common property among the Evangelical Estates; that the Confession has not yet been completed; that Melanchthon is uncertain about the future of the Confession, that is, as to whether it shall be completed and used or not.

That nothing was done on Sunday, 19th, after this letter was written, nor on Monday, 20th, in furtherance of concerted action as touching the Confession, nor towards the completion of the Confession, is demonstrably certain; for, Tuesday afternoon, June 21st, these Nurenberg legates write: "Since our last letter nothing further has been done."* They then describe the open ing of the Diet, Monday 20th, and Melanchthon's interview with Valdesius, the Imperial Secretary, who proposed that the whole matter should be treated briefly and privately. Not one word do they write about the Confession, or about concert of action, except to say that "nothing further has been done." The letter is finished at 5 o'clock, P. M.

It is thus demonstrable that up to so late an hour as 5 o'clock P. M. Tuesday, June 21st, these faithful and watchful Nurenberg legates not only know "nothing further" about concert of action, about a common confession, about the completion of the Saxon Confession, but they expressly report that "nothing further has been done" about these matters, for it is of these matters that they write, as the reference to their "last letter," which reports as its chief items the *status quo* of such things, plainly proves.

THE OPENING OF THE DIET.

The Nurenberg legates report the opening of the Diet as follow: "Monday the Mass of the Holy Ghost was sung at the Cathedral in the presence of all the Estates. Especially were the Elector of Saxony, Margrave George, Hessen and Lüneburg present, and they attended his majesty in all the

*C. R. II., 121.

ceremonies. After the service the Apostolic Nuncio (Vincentius Pimpinelli), in behalf of the Pope, from a lofty platform erected before the High Altar, delivered to the Emperor and the Imperial Estates a Latin oration more than an hour long, and admonished them most earnestly to resist the Turk and to put an end to the schism of the faith, and to settle other matters in the Empire.

"Then the Emperor, the King and all the Electors, Princes and Estates, adjourned to the *Rathhaus*, where *Duke Frederick*, in behalf of the Emperor, made a short address, and opened the Diet, and read the Programme according to which the Emperor would conduct the affairs of the Diet. Thereupon the Electors and Princes through Margrave *Joachim* delivered in reply an address expressive of loyalty and obedience. It was decided to give a copy of the Emperor's Programme (Vorhalten) to the Electors, Princes and Estates, that they might consider it and afterwards come together and consult. After this the Emperor and all the Estates, at 1 o'clock, P. M., so long had the session lasted, left the house."*

The Imperial Programme, or Proposition, in accordance with which the Diet was to be conducted, consists of two distinct parts. The first asks for a continuance of aid against the Turk. The second demands, *inter alia*, that the Electors, Princes and Estates shall present a written statement in German and Latin of their views and opinions touching the errors and abuses in religion.

It was the intention, evidently, of the Emperor to take up the Turkish question first. But the Evangelical Princes and Estates were of a different mind, and determined to reverse the order of the Programme.† They regarded the religious question as of paramount importance. Hence we are not surprised to learn

*For fuller and more minute accounts of the opening of the Diet, see Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, 73–5. Coelestin's *Historia* I., 103 *et seqq.;* Chytraeus' *Historia*, p. 52. The Imperial Programme, (Vorhalten), or *Propositio* as it is called in Latin, see for the German, Schirrmacher, pp. 79-81; J. J. Müller's *Historie*, pp. 564 *et seqq.*; Förstemann, I., pp. 306 *et seqq.;* for the Latin, Coelestin, I., pp. 120–121; Chytraeus, pp. 53–60.

†Schirrmacher, p. 81.

that "on the same day, [that is, on the afternoon of June 20th,] the Elector John assembled his allies in religion at his lodgings and exhorted them in an earnest and solemn address, faithfully and fearlessly to stand by and defend the cause of God and the pure religion, and not to allow themselves, through any threats or intimidations to be led to deny the same, since all machinations against God will be impotent, and the good cause will at length undoubtedly triumph."*

The supreme hour had now come, and yet still we nowhere read of an agreement on the part of the Evangelicals to present a *common* confession, nor of any invitation from the Elector to his co-religionists to accept *his* Confession and to join him in a *common* presentation. But the great and good man soon comprehended the magnitude of the situation, and resolved upon the step that brought about perfect unity of action among those who held the same evangelical faith. Coelestin has given the following account of the manner in which the Elector spent the next day, June 21st: "On the twenty-first day of the same month the Elector of Saxony, having sent all his counsellors and attendants from his presence, alone in secret read the Psalter, and most fervently prayed God, for the glory of his name and for the salvation of many souls, to assist, promote, advance and defend the cause of true religion.

"He also wrote down his good, pious reflections. These were given by John Dolsch, the Electoral Counsellor, to Melanchthon, who read them with admiration and returned them. The Elector's autograph was subsequently exhibited by Dolsch at Leipzig to many learned and honorable men, who read it.

"The same day about 8 o'clock, A. M., he carefully, alone, examined and pondered the Proposition which at the opening of the Diet had been read by order of the Emperor to all the Orders and Estates of the Empire. A little later, when about to take refreshments, he called in his son John Frederick, Philip Melanchthon and Dr. Pontanus (Brück), and conferred with them very confidentially about religion, and made known his plans, distinctly affirming that he would neither confer nor act in polit-

*Coelestin's *Historia* I., 121–2. See Müller, *Historie*, p. 568.

ical matters, except the cause of religion be first taken up for decision and determination, and yet he would make no pronunciamento without the advice of his allies in religion. Therefore, at 2 o'clock, P. M., he summons to his quarters the Estates kindred in religion. When all these had assembled at the appointed time, Duke John the Elector, ordered Doctor Pontanus to read the Proposition to all the Evangelical Orders present, with a loud and distinct utterance, so that each one could hear, understand and ponder it, and could declare publicly and make known his opinion concerning it. When the Proposition had been read, the Evangelical Estates say that they are diligently considering the whole subject, and that they wish to meet the Prince Elector the next day and to counsel with him."*

THE EVANGELICAL ESTATES AGREE TO PRESENT A COMMON CONFESSION.

The narrative by Coelestin shows that it was not until the forenoon of June 21st that the Elector made known his intention of taking his co-religionists into formal alliance with himself, and that it was not until the afternoon of that day that the alliance was consummated. We shall now show that it was not until the afternoon of that same day that it was agreed to make the Saxon Confession the *common* confession of the Evangelical Estates.

As already stated, the Nurenberg legates wrote to their senate on the afternoon of June 21st, finishing their letter at 5 o'clock, (see p. 36), and say that "nothing further had been done since their last letter." They then add a "Postrcript," written the same evening, and say: "After we had finished this letter, I, Kress, was summoned to the Elector's quarters. His Electoral Grace, Margrave George and the counsellors of Hesse and Lüneberg were there. They declare simply that inasmuch as the Elector has already had a Confession of faith composed, a copy of which you have received, they have presented themselves before the Elector and Margrave George for the purpose of joining the Elector. They are now holding a session over those articles,

*Coelestin, *Historia*, p. 122; Müller, *Historie*, p. 568; Cyprian, p. 65.

for the purpose of further revising, composing and finishing them.* It is the desire of the Princes that your Excellencies should immediately send your preachers, or whom you will, but especially Osiander, and would instruct them to help us to consider and to deliberate over these articles and whatever else is needed in the transaction."

This "Postscript" supplements and confirms the report quoted above from Coelestin, since both reports recite the transactions of the same persons, viz., of the Elector and the other Evangelical Estates, on the same afternoon, viz., that of Tuesday, June 21st, and at the same place, viz., at the lodgings of the Elector. Kress, the Nurenberg legate, was present at this Tuesday-afternoon meeting of the Princes and Estates, and writes, as an eyewitness, the items which he regards as the most important, viz., the consummation of the Nurenberg-Margrave plan of a common confession and of united action. He reports officially that it has now been decided to make the *Saxon* Confession the common confession of the Evangelicals, and that to that end the articles are being further *revised, composed* and *finished* by the Princes and their representatives.†

*Die weiter zu übersehen, zu stellen und zu beschliesen. We have translated *stellen*, "composing," since it is certain that in two places in this letter the word is used with that meaning. It may mean here *to arrange, to set in order. Beschliesen* which is here translated "finishing," may mean *to decide upon, to vote on.* The sentence taken as a whole reports careful, protracted, formal and official action on the Confession by the assembled Princes and their counsellors, and gives the first report we have of such joint action; as the "Postscript" itself marks the hour when union was consummated, 5 o'clock, P. M., June 21st. Of this there can be no question, since the report is official, and was made at the time when, and the place where the consummation of union was effected.

†This account is confirmed by Chancellor Brück, who wrote a history of the Diet of Augsburg, though he condenses in a single paragraph the account of the transactions of June 21st to June 23rd. He says: "Then the five, the Elector and the Princes, who were now obligated to present their Confession, and that too in three days, that is, on Friday, they, their preachers and their learned men, made ready therefor. But fearing lest they could not get ready and make a clean copy, since there was so much of it, so as to deliver it on Friday, they importuned the Imperial Chancellor, the Elector of Mayence, to have the matter deferred one day. He informed them that he would do it, were it in his power. But the Emperor

Hence it is not until this Tuesday evening after 5 o'clock, that we have what may be called the *relatively finished* Augsburg Confession, though Melanchthon, so the historians constantly affirm, continued to make changes in it up to the last hour before delivery. The Imperial Proposition had made a like demand of each Prince and Estate. On the side of the Evangelicals only the Elector of Saxony was in a situation to meet that demand; for he alone had in readiness a carefully prepared statement touching the matters in dispute. After devout prayer, mature deliberation, and conference with trusted advisers, he resolves to act in concert with his co-religionists, and so invites them to a conference *which results in their acceptance and adoption of his Confession as their Confession.* A common danger, the consciousness of being one in their faith, a common obligation to obey the Imperial command, had brought them to see the wisdom and the desirability of having and of presenting a common confession. How far into the evening, or the night, of Tuesday 21st, they continued their work of elaboration and revision, we do not know, but we do know that such work was not yet completed.

had decided to hear the Papal legate, Cardinal Campeggius, on Friday, St. John's Day, and that then they would be expected to make answer. Hence a change could not be made. Then the Elector and Princes had to submit, and had to make ready their articles, so far as they could do so in such haste. And because the legates of the cities of Nurenberg and Reutlingen had been instructed to join the Elector and the Princes, they with and after the Elector and Princes signed the articles," pp. 50, 51. We have here again the positive proof that very much work remained to be done on the Confession after it had been decided by the Protestants, June 21st, to unite in a common confession.

Chancellor Gregory Brück's *Geschichte der Religionshandlungen auf dem Reichstage zu Augsburg in J. 1530*, is found in Foerstemann's *Archiv fuer die Geschichte der Kirchlichen Reformation*. Halle, 1831. 1. Band, 1. Heft. The copy used by us was kindly loaned from the "Neander Library" in the Rochester Theological Seminary. This History is of great value, as it was written by one of the most active and influential officials at the Diet. J. J. Müller has quoted extensively from it as *Auctor Apologiae Manuscriptae*. It was also used by Cyprian.

THE CONFESSION FINISHED AND SIGNED.

Coelestin, after reciting what was done by the Elector and Estates, as quoted above on p. 38, continues right on, as follows: "When, therefore, on the following day (June 22d), the Protestants came together, it was unanimously agreed, after deliberation, that no action should be taken touching political matters until religion and the Christian faith had been treated and decided upon, and that they would not assent to the demands of the Emperor to continue aid against the Turk until they had treated of, and reached a decision in regard to, the articles of faith and the peace of the Christian Church." He then recites the Response made by the Princes to the Imperial Proposition, in which Response the declaration is made that attention must be first given in the Diet to the cause of religion. He then proceeds as follows: "When, therefore, the Emperor had been informed of these things (contained in the Response) he commanded the Elector of Saxony and the other Princes allied in religion to offer and to present to him the written Confession and summary of their faith, and to exhibit the methods by which they thought to correct and to remove the abuses in the Church.

"On the Vigil of John the Baptist, Thursday, June 23d, at the request of the Elector of Saxony, the articles of the Confession were read in a large assembly of the Evangelical Orders, with the purpose and intent especially, that if any one thought anything in them ought to be changed, he might speak freely and candidly and might so declare. When the reading was ended, and they (the articles of the Confession) were approved by all, it was decided to ask the Emperor the next day, to consent to have them read in the presence of all the Orders of the Empire."*

This narrative of facts is confirmed by the official letter of the Nurenberg legates, who were present at, and took part in, this meeting of Thursday, June 23d. Early on the morning of Saturday, June 25th, they reported to their senate. After reciting that on Wednesday the Evangelical Estates had decided to demand that the subject of religion should take precedence of every-

*Coelestin, *Historia*, I., 123b. See Müller's *Historie*, p. 569; also Brück's *Geschichte*, pp. 49, 50.

thing else, they report as follows: "Last Thursday morning, we and the legate from Reutlingen were summoned into the presence of the Saxon, the Hessian, Margrave George and Lüneburg. There in the presence of all their Princely Graces, counsellors and theologians—there were twelve theologians, besides other scholars and doctors,—the afore-mentioned Confession of faith was read, examined and considered, so that it could be read yesterday afternoon to the Emperor in the presence of the Estates of the Empire. Then because the copying, and the composition (Stellen) of the Preface and Conclusion, consumed considerable time, the Elector and Princes through their counsellors, besought the Emperor for an extension of time. But this was denied them, and yesterday at three o'clock in the afternoon the Emperor and all the Estates came to the house,"* that is, the *Rathaus*, as we know from other accounts that this second session of ot the Diet was held at that place.

No less than four efforts were made that Friday afternoon, June 24th, by the Evangelicals to have their Confession read before the Emperor and the assembled Estates of the Empire; but they were crowded out by a speech from the Papal Legate, Cardinal Campeggius, by the speeches of the legates of Lower Austria, by the growing lateness of the hour, and by the Emperor's unwillingness to have the Confession *read*, and his wish to have it left with him. But the Evangelicals "vehemently insisted" that they must be allowed to *read* their Confession, and finally that they must be allowed to retain it over night "in order properly to revise and correct it, since they had been hurried."† The Nurenberg legates then go on to say in this their letter of Saturday morning, June 25th: "The Confession, in so far as the articles of faith are concerned, is in substance al-

*C. R. II., 127. See a lengthy account of this second session of the Diet, June 24th, in Coelestin's *Historia*, I, 123 b *et seqq.* Engelhardt, speaking of the report of the Nurenbergers, says: "The Protocol of June 23rd describes the last act of completion." *Niedner's Zeitschrift* (1865), p. 577.

†See the letter of the Nurenbergers in C. R. II., pp. 127–130; Coelestin, *Historia*, I., 124–134; Chytraeus, *Historia*, pp. 61–69; Schirrmacher, 82-3; Cyprian *Historia*, Beylagen, VI., p. 76, Beylagen, IX., pp. 105 *et seqq.*; Brück's *Geschichte*, pp. 51 *et seqq.*

most in accord with what we have already sent you; but in some parts it is improved, and everywhere it is made as mild as possible though in our judgment, nothing necessary has been omitted.* Hence we have agreed to all this, and in your name have joined the Princes and Reutlingen."†

*Melanchthon wrote to Camerarius, June 26th: "I was changing and making over many things daily, and would have made more changes, had our counsellors permitted it; and so far am I from judging that I have written too mildly, I fear that some have been offended by our boldness. For Valdesius, the Imperial Secretary, saw it before we presented it, and thought it was so sharp that the adversary could not tolerate it." C. R. II., p. 140.

†C. R. II., p. 120. The authentic documentary facts recited in the text in the pages above show how incorrect and unreliable are certain statements made by Dr. Krauth: "The 'form of the Confession' sent on May 11th was the Augsburg Confession substantially identical with it as a whole, and in all that is really essential to it verbally identical." *Conservative Reformation*, p. 226.

Again: Writing of Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd (LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Vol. XXIX., p. 523) he says: "This letter shows:

1. "That Melanchthon desired Luther to know all that he was doing.

2. "That the Articles of Faith were finished, and that the changes were confined to the Articles on Abuses." *Ibid*, p. 228. As a matter of fact Melanchthon did not write a word to Luther about the Confession from May 22nd to June 25th, and yet he and other learned men were daily making changes in it. Article XX., one of the most important in the entire Confession, and perhaps Article XXI., the Preface and Conclusion, were composed after May 22nd as the Nurenberg Protocol clearly shows. The Protocol, and Melanchthon's letter of June 26th to Camerarius, speak of daily changes that were made. It is purely gratuitous to say that these "were confined to the Articles on Abuses." Also: The official and other contemporary documents in hand, from which we have so liberally quoted in the text, put the eternal quietus on Dr. Krauth's theory, viz., that some time after June 14th, 1530, in an assembly of the Princes, other officials, and preachers, the Confession was discussed and determined upon sentence by sentence in order, and then in its "final form" was sent to Luther for his examination, was received back again with his approval, and *after that* was delivered to the Emperor. See *Conservative Reformation*, p. 232-3; *First Free Lutheran Diet in America*, pp. 238 *et seqq.*, particularly p. 240; *A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession*, pp. 54 *et seqq.*, particularly p. 61: "The German Formula is submitted June 14, and after this comes the discussion mentioned by Melanchthon."

Dr. Krauth bases his theory of a *third* sending to Luther, etc., on a paragraph in Melanchthon's Latin Preface (written February 16th, 1560) to the *Corpus Doctrinae*. The German Preface to the German *Corpus Doctrinae* was written September 29th, 1559. They are both given

We thus see that the Augsburg Confession was *revised, corrected* and *improved* up to the last hour before its delivery. The proof by which this proposition is established is documentary

also in C. R. IX., respectively at pp. 929 *et seqq.*, and 1050 *et seqq.* We submit a translation of the German section in question, and the Latin paragraph with Dr. Krauth's translation of the same:

"Finally this Confession, so God ordained and granted, was composed by myself, and the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther declared that it pleased him. But prior to its being publicly read before the Emperor, it was laid before the Elector, the Princes, and legates, who subscribed it. These, with their counsellors and preachers, who were present, diligently pondered all the Articles. As now the Emperor required an answer, this Confession was read publicly in the presence of the Emperor and of all the Electors, Princes and Counsellors, who were at the Diet. Then the copy was given to the Emperor who had it read again in his own council."

Congessi igitur simplici studio capita Confessionis quae extat, complexus pene summam doctrinae Ecclesiarum nostrarum, et ut Imperatori responderetur, et ut falsa crimina depellerentur. Ac nihil mihi sumi. Praesentibus Principibus, et aliis gubernatoribus et concionatoribus, disputatum est ordine de singulis sententiis. Missa est deinde et Luthero tota forma Confessionis, qui Principibus scripsit, se hanc Confessionem et legisse et probare. Haec ita acta esse, Principes, et alii honesti et docti viri adhuc superstites meminerunt. Postea coram Imperatore Carolo, in magna frequentia Principum, lecta est haec confessio, quod ostendit non esse obtrusam Caesari non poscenti.

DR. KRAUTH'S TRANSLATION.

"I. 'I brought together the principal points of the Confession, embracing pretty nearly the sum of the doctrines of our Churches.'

"II. 'I assumed nothing to myself, for in the presence of the Princes and other officials, and of the preachers, it was discussed and determined upon in regular order, sentence by sentence.'

"III. The complete form of the Confession was *subsequently* sent to Luther, who wrote to the Princes that he had read the Confession and approved it. That these things were so done, the Princes, and other honest and learned men, *yet living*, well remember.

"IV. "*After this* (*postea*) before the Emperor Charles, in a great assemblage of the Princes, this Confession was read."

Dr. Krauth follows his translation *immediately* with the following statement and explanation: "This extract shows, 1. that this complete Confession—the *tota forma*—the Articles on Doctrines and Abuses, as contrasted with any earlier and imperfect form of the Confession, was submitted to Luther." "2. This is wholly distinct from Luther's endorsement of the Confession as sent May 11th, for that was not the '*tota forma*,' but relatively unfinished; that had not been discussed before Princes,

and official. The facts were written down at the time by those who participated in the tranactions, and were reported to the Nurenberg Senate. These facts in their essential parts are con-

officials, and preachers, for they were not yet at Augsburg." *Conservative Beformation*, p. 233. See also "*First Free Lutheran Diet in America*," pp. 238–240.

1. The critical reader will observe that Dr. Krauth has failed to translate a part of the Latin extract without giving notice of any omission.

2. That he has divided his translation into paragraphs, whereas the original is a single paragraph. If no advantage had been sought for the theory by such paragraphing, why was it made?

3. In the translation certain words are italicized. There are no italics in the original.

4. The translation of disputatum est ordine de singulis sententiis by, "it was discussed and determined upon in regular course, sentence by sentence," is more than questionable. But we leave the question of the accuracy of such a translation to Latin scholars; and the question as to whether such a translation can fairly represent the facts in the case, we leave with those who have carefully studied the facts of the transactions of June 15th—21st given in the text above, and in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for July 1897, pp. 323–6, and July 1898, pp. 387 *et seqq*.

5. Melanchthon wrote tota forma Confessionis. Dr. Krauth in his explanation makes "*tota forma*" the equivalent of "complete Confession." He thus fails to observe the difference (recognized by every logician) between the *form* of a thing and the *thing itself*, in this case the difference between the *tota forma Confessionis* and the *tota Confessio*. Melanchthon was too good a logician to make such confusion. He does not say the *tota Confessio*, the "complete Confession," was sent to Luther, but the tota forma Confessionis was sent. We know that the *tota forma Confessionis*, *Der fertige Entwurf*, *Prima Adumbratio*, was sent to Luther, May 11th, and was approved by him. Of any other, that is, of a *second*, or of a *third*, sending of the Confession to Luther, we have no record whatever, either from the pen of Melanchthon, or from that of any other contemporaneous writer. The German Preface, and the Latin Preface, speaks each of *only one* submission of the Confession to Luther. This is the important, the *essential* thing, the *one* sending. Had there been more than one sending, Melanchthon would have falsified history by writing in his two prefaces as he did. The prefaces differ somewhat as to the order of events, but not as to the fact of a *single* submission. The German Preface, as every scholar will perceive, is more specific than the Latin, and follows in a more orderly way the course of events as given in the "Protocol," and in other documents quoted in the text above. It is very manifest that in the German Preface Melanchthon has in mind the meetings of the Evangelicals, June 21st and 23d, and the fact that *prior* to such meetings the Confession had been approved by Luther. In the Latin Preface he says: Praesentibus Principibus, et gubernatoribus et conscionatoribus disputatum est,—a rather general statement.

firmed by the official report of the Frankfort a. M. legates to their senate, and by the official report of the Strassburg legates to their Senate. They cannot now be called in question.

In the retinue of the Elector, which reached Augsburg, May 2nd, were the following persons, named by J. J. Müller, in his *Historie*, pp. 455–56, who took the list from the official records:

"I. PRINCES.

1. The Electoral Prince, Duke John Frederick.
2. Duke Francis of Lüneburg.
3. Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt.

[These three, together with the Elector, signed the Confession.]

"COUNTS AND LORDS.

1. Count Albert of Mansfeld.
2. Count Ernst of Gleichen.
3. Count Jobst of Mansfeld.
4. The Lord of Wildenfels.

"III. NOBLE COUNSELLORS.

1. Frederick von Thun.
2. Sebastian and } Marshals of Pappenheim.
3. Joachim, }
4. Hans von Minckwitz.
5. Hans von Weissenbach.
6. Conrad Gossmann.
7. Ewald von Brandenstein.

"IV. LEARNED COUNSELLORS.

1. Dr. Gregory Brück, Chancellor.
2. Dr. Christian Baier, Chancellor.
3. Christopher Gross.

"V. NOBLES.

Seven Knights and seventy noblemen.

"VI. MINISTERS.

1. Dr. Martin Luther, who was left at Coburg.
2. Justus Jonas.
3. George Spalatin.
4. Philip Melanchthon.
5. John Agricola, who was brought by Count Albert of Mansfeld."

Dr. Fiege (Ficulnus) the Hessian Chancellor, and Erhard Schnepf, Chaplain of the Landgrave of Hesse, came to Augsburg May 3rd, (C. R. II., 39, Jonas's *Briefwechsel* I., p. 148.) Thus every condition required by the Praesentibus Principibus *et al.* is supplied by May 11th, and yet Dr. Krauth says (*Conservative Reformation*, p. 233): "That (that is, the form of the Confession sent to Luther, May 11th: see above) had not been discussed before Princes, officials, and preachers, *for they were not yet at*

Hence to speak of an Augsburg Confession or of a common confession of the Lutherans *prior* to June 21st, 1530, is to speak unhistorically and inaccurately, for *prior* to that date, it *was*, and

Augsburg," (Italics ours.) How is that for history,—"*they were not yet at Augsburg*"?; and how did Dr. Krauth *know* that the form of the Confession sent to Luther May 11th had not been first thoroughly discussed before Princes, officials, and preachers? Where is the document that says it was not so discussed? and does the reader for one moment suppose that the *tota forma*, or any other form, of the Confession would be sent to Luther May 11th, without having been first thoroughly discussed?

But we are not disposed to refer Melanchthon's statement—Praesentibus Principibus *et al.*—*exclusively* to any one particular meeting and discussion. Melanchthon evidently means to say that prior to the delivery of the Confession to the Emperor, every article of it was discussed in an orderly way before the Princes *et al.*—"Diligently pondered all the articles"—*German Preface.* We know from the contemporaneous official reports that the Confession received such discussion, June 21st and June 23rd. We know from the Nurenberg "Protocol" that on other occasions the Saxon officials and theologians held daily sessions over the Confession. But there can be no doubt that in both prefaces Melanchthon had in mind *chiefly* the meetings and discussions of June 21st and 23rd for these unquestionably were the most important meetings held by the Princes *et al.* over the Confession, since at the former the Confession formally *ceased* to be the Confession of the Elector alone, and became *formally* and *really* the common Confession of the Evangelicals, and at the latter meeting it "was read, examined and considered." Such meetings could not possibly have been overlooked, or ignored, or forgotten, by Melanchthon, in making a record of the genesis of the Confession. Moreover, it is demonstrably certain from the "Postscript" of the Nurenberg "Protocol" (see text p. 39) that the Confession *did not become the common property of the Evangelicals, until late in the afternoon of June 21st*—for they, the counsellors of Hesse and Lüneburg, distinctly say "that they have presented themselves before the Elector and Margrave George for the purpose of joining the Elector,"—and then it would have been *too late to send the* "complete Confession" to Luther, and to get it back with his approval in time for its delivery to the Emperor, June 25th, since it is universally admitted that it required from six to eight days to make the trip from Augsburg to Coburg and return.

6. Dr. Krauth says: "The German Formula is submitted June 14th, and after this comes the discussion mentioned by Melanchthon, with the express inference from the 'deinde' that it 'was sent again, as it seems.' " *A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession*, p. 61. There can be no doubt that the discussion mentioned by Melanchthon has its *chief* reference to something that occurred after June 14th. In so far we entirely agree with Dr. Krauth. But: (a.) In the many official documents, private and official accounts, relating to and reporting the transactions of June 15th to

was still *called*, the Saxon Confession, and was *incomplete*. Prior to that date the other Protestant Princes and Estates had *not even been invited* by the Elector to accept *his* Confession as

20th, including the latter date, there is no record, nor even the shadow of an intimation, of the occurrence of such a discussion. (See text, p. 39). (b.) It has been shown in the text that during those six eventful days the Princes, other officials, and the preachers were so strenuously and continually occupied day and night, (some of them were called out of bed late at night, C. R. II., 106,) that no time could possibly have been left to them for any such discussion as the theory presupposes—"sentence by sentence," for since it took Dr. Beyer two hours to read the Confession before the Emperor, it would have taken more than ten times two hours to discuss it "sentence by sentence," since it contains more than four hundred sentences. If we be not mistaken this is a case of *reductio ad absurdum*.

(c.) June 20th Luther at Coburg wrote to Jonas that for three full weeks he had not heard a word from Augsburg (De Wette IV., p. 45.) Had the "complete Confession" been sent to Luther June 15th or 16th or 17th, it would have had, at the least, four days in which to reach Coburg by the evening of the 20th. That it did not come prior to the 20th is certain. That it did not come on the 20th is certainly an "express inference" from the fact that in the three letters written by Luther on that day, respectively to the Landgrave of Hesse, to Erhard Schnepf, to Justus Jonas (De Wette IV., 23, 44, 45) there is not even any allusion to the Confession, nor to the reception on that day of any communication from Augsburg, except the letter from Jonas; nor is there extant any letter from Prince, official or theologian, at Augsburg to Luther, written after June 13th till June 19th (that of Melanchthon in which there is no allusion to the Confession, C. R. II., 118), except that of Jonas, dated June 18th, quoted above in a note. Nor is there any letter extant from Luther to any Prince, official or theologian, at Augsburg, written after June 20th till June 25th, the day on which the Confession was publicly read; nor is there any evidence that any letter or communication from the places named above to any of the persons named above, written during the intervals mentioned above, has been lost.

Again: Had Luther, prior to writing the Landgrave, June 20th, (see p. 31 n), received the Confession in its "final form," as it had been "discussed and determined upon in the presence of Princes" *et al.*,—and such discussion, etc., would certainly have been reported to him in sending the Confession,—he would most certainly have made some allusion to the Confession in writing the Landgrave about the Zwinglians. Nay, rather, he would not have written him at all, since in his relations to the Confession there would have been proof positive that the Landgrave had forsaken the Zwinglians. And had the Princes received a letter from Luther just before June 25th, approving the Confession, some allusion or reference would undoubtedly have been made to it in the Elector's letter of June 25th,

theirs, and to join him in a common declaration of the doctrine preached and taught in the churches of their respective dominions. The Nurenberg letter of June 21st, beginning: "Since

(given in Schirrmacher, pp. 87–89) to Luther. But the whole tone and content of the letter shows that nothing had been heard or received from Luther in the recent past.

This, we know, is the argument from silence; but when the silence appears just where speech is most appropriate, and is required by the circumstances, on the supposition that the Confession had been recently sent to, and returned by, Luther,—the argument from silence is conclusive, unless met by clear statements and known facts to the contrary.

7. Suppose that Luther received the "complete Confession" from Augsburg, June 20th, (we have demonstrated that he could not have received it earlier)—suppose for the sake of argument that he received it June 20th, and examined it the same day, and returned it with his approval the next day, what then? Why this: It could not possibly have reached Augsburg in time to influence the final decision, for there is no evidence that any letter sent from Coburg to Augsburg reached its destination in less than four days. Already on the afternoon of June 21st the Princes *et al.* were engaged in making a final revision of the Confession—*Die weiter zu uebersehen, zu stellen und zu beschliessen.* Thursday, June 23d, that final revision was completed, and the Confession was *signed*, and became to all intents and purposes the "complete Confession," the Augsburg Confession of History.

But it is demonstrable that Luther did not receive the Confession, June 20th, in its "final form" as it had been "discussed and determined upon in the presence of Princes" *et al.*, in the sense of Dr. Krauth's theory; for the simple reason that up to June 19th, (see the "Protocol," p. 35 in the text above), the Elector had not even unequivocally *promised* to take his co-religionists into alliance with himself. Hence up to that time there was no meeting of the Princes and other officials (the Nurenberg and Reutlingen legates as Dr. Krauth interprets *gubernatores*) to discuss and determine upon the Confession in the sense of Dr. Krauth's theory. And had such meeting taken place June 19th or 20th, the Nurenberg legates would not have written, June 21st: "Since our last letter, [June 19th, early in the morning], nothing further has been done," (C. R. II., 121); that is, nothing further has been done about the Confession and about the proposed alliance.

8. June 23d, when the articles had been "approved by all and each, it was decided"—decretum fuit—to ask the Emperor to allow the Confession to be read before all the orders of the Empire (Coelestin, *Historia*, I., 123b). This shows that the Princes *et al.* were not awaiting word from Luther. And when they sought to have the reading deferred a day, it was not that they might hear from Luther, but that they might finish the Confession and make a clean copy. So says Chancellor Brück, who was too honorable to falsify, and, writing some months after the adjournment of the Diet, could have had no reason for keeping back a part of the truth,

our last letter nothing further has been done," and its "Postscript," remove all question as to the very afternoon on which union was consummated. There is no way of escaping this

and such an important part as this would have been. Brück's *Geschichte*, p. 50.

June 24th they "insisted vehemently" (heftig angehalten, say the Nurenbergers, C. R. II., 128; vehementissime urgent et obsecrant, Schirrmacher, p. 83; Landgravius plane hoc dimicavit et ursit, ut coram statibus imperii et Caesare articuli praelegerentur et voce recitarentur, writes Jonas, *Briefwechsel* I., 163), that their Confession might be read *at that time*. This is equal to a demonstration that they were not expecting anything from Luther; nor is there to be found a single word in the many and full accounts of the transactions of June 21st, 22nd, 23d, that indicates that anything had been sent to Luther, or that anything was awaited from Luther, as preliminary to responding to the Imperial Proposition issued, June 20th. This, we think, is another case of *reductio ad absurdum*, that is, in view of all the known facts, Dr. Krauth's theory seems absurd.

But the whole theory is shown to be without historical basis by the "Postscript" in the Nurenberg "Protocol," June 21st—everywhere ignored by Dr. Krauth—which "Postscript," (taken in connection with the Nurenbergers' letter of June 19th), makes it historically *demonstrable* that it was not until that day that the Princes *et al.* UNITED *on the Saxon Confession as their common Confession*, and THEN in the Elector's lodgings began the work of final revision and of completing the Confession—a work which was practically concluded two days later. Indeed, that "Postscript" alone decides the matter, for it makes it as clear as the sunlight that "absolute unity of presentation" (Dr. Krauth's phrase) was not agreed upon until late in the afternoon of June 21st, and that on that afternoon the Confession was undergoing a thorough revision, which was completed on the 23rd. Hence well does J. J. Müller say that during those days "they worked almost day and night in completing and copying the Confession." *Historie*, p. 571.

Again: Dr. Krauth says that " 'gubernatores' * * * refers especially to the government officials, the legates who represented Nürnberg and Reutlingen." *A Chronicle*, p. 83. Be it so, (for the sake of argument.) But we know with documentary certainty, by official report, that the first meeting of the Princes *et al.* attended by any Nurenberg legate (Kress) in whose "presence" the Confession "was discussed and determined upon in order," was that of June 21st, (see the "Postscript,") and the first meeting of the kind at which the Reutlingen legate is known to have been present was that of June 23d. (C. R. II., 127.) Dr. Krauth's explanation is thus shown to be fatal to his theory.

While we hazard nothing in saying that the "Postscript" alone furnishes the all-sufficient instrument for a complete refutation of Dr. Krauth's theory of a third sending, in that it enables us to fix the very hour in which "absolute unity of presentation" was agreed upon, we have nevertheless

conclusion except by impeaching the veracity of the Nurenberg legates.

What changes were made in the Confession, June 21st and

adduced the other facts for the purpose of showing that the theory is absolutely destitute of historical basis; that it is contradicted by all the known facts relating to the times, circumstances and conditions subsequent to June 14th,—in a word that it is the figment of a fertile brain, which has ignored official testimony, and much other original documentary evidence, and, in opposition to the usage of the most eminent scholars—some of them Melanchthon's own pupils and commensals—for two hundred years, has put its own interpretation on Melanchthon's Latin Preface—which is sufficiently explained by the German Preface which, so far as we can learn, has not been quoted, except in isolated words and phrases. Let him that would now defend the theory adduce the facts to prove it,—let him prove that Melanchthon in his two prefaces means to affirm that the Confession was sent to Luther before its delivery more than *once;* that the sending implied in the German Preface was different from that expressed in the Latin Preface; that the Confession reached Luther on or after June 20th,—for no earlier date is possible—; that it and Luther's letter of approval to the Princes reached Augsburg before the Confession was publicly read in "the great assemblage of the Princes." It is to the proof of the matter in exactly such form that the defender of the theory must address himself.

But it must be understood that we have not undertaken to prove a negative. We are no more required by the laws of logic and the rules of debate to prove that the "complete Confession" was *not* sent to Luther after June 14th, and before its delivery, than we are required to prove that it was not at the same time sent to the Pope at Rome. We have undertaken to show, and we believe we have shown, that the known facts leave no room for the theory; and we know of not a single modern German historian of the Confession who *asserts* or *defends* such a theory, (for a seeming exception, see Francke, below.)

9. On pp. 56 *et seqq.* in the *A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession*, Dr. Krauth discussed the "*Character and Value of Melanchthon's Testimony*," that is, of the Latin Preface-Extract now under consideration. He then names, pp. 56, 57, twenty authors between 1570 and 1867, by whom "and by many others," this Extract has been "quoted." Of the character and value of this Extract there never has been a question. It is both genuine and authentic. That is, Melanchthon is its author, and its author's name is the sufficient guarantee for the correctness of its statements, not, however, for Dr. Krauth's interpretation.

Many readers of the *A Chronicle*, we happen to know, have supposed that Dr. Krauth adduced these authorities as interpreting Melanchthon's Preface in support of a *third* sending, etc. We have before us, as we write, all of these authorities (except those numbered 6, 9, 10, 11, 16, two of which are Reformed) and "many others" not named by Dr. Krauth. With two exceptions these authorities now before us employ this extract in sup-

June 23rd, and even later, we know not. We know that it was made as "mild as possible." Had its delivery to the Emperor been delayed, unquestionably it would have been changed still further, since it was the express policy of Melanchthon to adapt it to circumstances.

Hence we see that the authority of the Confession does not

port of one, or other, or all, of the propositions: That Melanchthon assumed nothing to himself; that he consulted with Luther and others; that the Confession was sent to Luther before it was publicly read. Some of them (see especially those incomparable scholars and historians of the Confession, Kirchner, Selneccer and Chemnitz, the two last, pupils of Melanchthon, *Gruendliche Historia*, p. 109; Carpzov, *Isagoge*, pp. 104, 105; Salig, *Historia*, *A. C.* p. 168; Boerner, *institutiones*, p. 42; Danz. *Die Augsb. Conf.* pp. 6, 9, 10,) employ it in express connection with the sending of May 11th, *which nobody ever disputed.* Hence so far are these learned authorities from supporting the theory of a *third* sending, etc., that they are *properly* quoted only when they are quoted *directly* against such a theory.

Walch (Dr. Krauth's 17) refers to the Preface-Extract in a second-hand, and hence in a most unscholarly way, and then says: "Thus revised and approved by all, the Confession was sent to Luther." *Introductio*, p. 169. But Walch had never seen the Nurenberg "Protocol," which Dr. Krauth has ignored in some of its most important parts, particularly the "Postscript"—Had Walch seen the "Postscript," he would have seen that the Confession was not revised and approved by all until June 21st.

Francke (Dr. Krauth's 23,) after quoting the Preface-Extract, simply says: Iterum ergo, ut videtur, *missa est* being understood after the *ergo. Libri Symbolici*, p. XVIII. He too has overlooked or ignored important parts of the "Protocol," and especially the "Postscript." Thus it turns out that the whole weight of Dr. Krauth's learned authorities (17 and 23 excepted, in the way we have shown) is against Dr. Krauth's theory.

10. Of the many learned men, who during a period of two hundred years after 1530, wrote histories of, and commentaries on, the Augsburg Confession,—Chancellor Brück, Chytraeus (German 1576, Latin 1578.) Coelestin 1577. Selneccer 1583, Kirchner, Selneccer and Chemnitz 1584, Hutter 1602, Mentzer 1613, John Müller 1630, Carpzov 1665, Calov 1688, J. J. Müller 1705, Hoffmann 1727, Funcke 1730, Cyprian 1730, Salig 1730—of these and many others we have examined on the subject, not one holds a theory of a *third* sending, or has so interpreted Melanchthon's Preface, or has given, so far as we can discover, any intimation that he even imagined that the Confession had been sent to Luther three times before its delivery. From Walch, 1732, to the present day we know of no German scholar (Francke's "videtur" excepted) who has followed Walch in his interpretation of Melanchthon's Preface, and has declared for a *third* sending.

lie in the letter of it, and that even after it had been signed,* it was not regarded as a fixed law, or as an unalterable statement of the Lutheran doctrine. Its authority with its subscribers lay in the supposition and belief that its "doctrine does not differ from the Scriptures, nor from the Catholic Church, nor from the Roman Church in so far as it is known from writers."

LUTHER NOT CONSULTED ABOUT THE CONFESSION FROM MAY 22ND UNTIL AFTER JUNE 25TH.

Strange as it may appear, it is nevertheless a fact that there is not known to exist a single syllable of evidence that Luther was consulted about the preparation of the Confession after May 22nd. From that date to June 25th he was written to, June 1st by the Elector, June 12th and 13th by Jonas, June 13th by Melanchthon, June 18th by Jonas, June 19th by Melanchthon. But not one of the letters informs him of the work that is being done on the Confession, or inquires for his opinion, or asks his advice about the "Apology" or the Confession that is the subject of so much care and anxiety at Augsburg. Of the letters, eighteen in number, written by Luther to his friends at Augsburg, from April 23d to June 29th, only one, that of May 15th to the Elector, makes any reference to the Confession. All the rest are as silent on the subject as though no such thing as an "Apology," or a Confession, had ever existed. Hence barring the marginal notes referred to in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, October, 1899, p. 523, *n.*, it is impossible to show that Luther exerted any influence on, or contributed anything to, the composition of the Confession after April 22nd; and equally impossible is it to show that he expressed any opinion, barring the letter of May 15th to the Elector, on the "Apology" or Confession, until June 29th, that is, four days after it had been delivered to the Emperor. What is perhaps the most remarkable of all is the

*It is agreed among scholars that the Confession was signed at the meeting of the Princes *et al.* June 23rd. See Weber *Kritische Geschichte*, I., p. 320; Francke, *Libri Symb.* p. XIX.; Plitt, I., 534; Krauth, *A Chronicle of the A. C.*, p. 46. We know that it was "signed" already when the Princes sought to have it read, June 24th. See C. R. II., 128; Jonas's *Briefwechsel*, I., p. 163.

fact that Luther never wrote a line to Melanchthon about the "Apology," until after June 25th, though Melanchthon three times, May 4th, 11th, 22nd, gave Luther information about the "Apology," and at least furnished Luther the opportunity to write him about it.

These are facts that cannot be called in question. Some learned men have tried to explain them, or to explain them away. But they cannot be explained away, and no satisfactory explanation of them has fallen under the eye of the present writer. They are given here as a part of the history of the Augsburg Confession. They show to a demonstration that Luther's influence at Augsburg from May 2nd to June 25th was far less than some persons have supposed and declared. Within this period he was not the inspirer and director of the movements at Augsburg. For "three full weeks" he was left in total ignorance of what was going on there. For more than four weeks he was not informed of the daily changes made in the "Apology."

And yet it is not intended by this recital of facts to affirm, or even to intimate, that Luther exerted no influence at Augsburg within the dates last written. He prayed for his friends at Augsburg, and exhorted them, especially the Elector and Melanchthon to steadfastness. But this he did much more *after* June 25th than before that time, as the letters before us clearly show.* It was not until he had read the copy of the Confession† sent him by Melanchthon, June 26th, and was asked what further concessions were to be made, and perceived that the leading Protestants were intent upon reconciliation with the enemy, that he threw himself into the balance and measurably resumed the old dictatorship which many a time had brought inspiration to the hearts of his friends, and had sent terror to the heart of the foe. But even then he could write to Melanchthon: "I am displeased because in your letters you write that in this matter you have followed my authority. I will neither be, nor be called, your authority in this matter."‡

*DeWette, IV. 53, 49, 62, 63, 65, 82, 83, 84, 88, 89, 91 *et passim.*
†C. R. II., 141.
‡DeWette, IV. 53.

Perhaps no one has stated the whole case more in accordance with the facts than the learned and conservative Plitt. He says: "It would be a mistake to suppose that Luther from Coburg directed affairs on the evangelical side at Augsburg. From his fortress he followed all the proceedings there with the closest attention. He had them continually before him. He lived through them and fought through them inwardly, and especially did he carry them on his most faithful, praying heart, As a matter of fact he exerted a great influence on the course of events. But he did not purposely and intentionally do so. On the contrary, so far as was in him, he purposely refrained from such influencing, and repeatedly expressed himself to the contrary, when something of the kind was expected of him at Augsburg. *The cause is not mine*, he said. Only in the beginning of his sojourn at Coburg, in his *Admonition to the Clergy Assembled at Augsburg*,* did he undertake, in his own strong and free way, to warn them for *their own sake*, not to aim the bow too high, inasmuch as Münzer's spirit is not yet dead, but finally to propose peace, as he summoned them to make the doctrine of the gospel free. And then when his friends at Augsburg showed signs of weakening, and the essential thing seemed to be in peril, even with greater vehemence did he cast his sword into the scale. In other matters he quietly held himself aloof, and let things come to him, in order to express himself about them occasionally, as it seemed good to him."†

This we regard as an intelligent, fair and impartial statement of the facts touching the question of Luther's influence on the

*This *Admonition* was addressed to the *Catholic*, not to the Lutheran, Clergy at Augsburg. Erlangen Edition of Luther's Works, 24:356. It has been called "Luther's Augsburg Confession." It contains a wonderful commingling of mildness and severity. It is a lifelike picture of the real Luther, who calls it meam invectivam contra Ecclesiasticos, De Wette, IV., 15. It was known at Augsburg by June 7th. *Strassburg Politische Correspondenz*, p. 451. Jonas writes to Luther: "Your truly prophetical book is read and applauded by all the pious, gods and men, while Satan rages and gnashes his teeth," *Briefwechsel* I., 153. Its sale at Augsburg was forbidden by command of the Emperor. C. R., II., 91.

†Dr. Martin Luther's Leben, pp. 363–4.

Diet of Augsburg. It will be observed that the learned author does not even mention the Augsburg Confession as coming within the scope of that influence. He also declares that it is a mistake to suppose that Luther directed affairs at Augsburg.

If the question be asked, Why did not Luther take a lively interest in the composition of the Confession, we may suggest the following reasons: 1. He was only once *officially* consulted about the Confession, May 11th. 2. He was very much occupied with the translation of the Prophets, and of Aesop, and with other literary work. Of his literary labors he makes frequent mention in his correspondence.* 3. He did not expect that anything of importance would be accomplished at or by the Diet.†

THE PUBLIC READING OF THE CONFESSION.

It will add much to the interest and value of this paper to have an account of the public reading of the Confession from the pens of those who were present and witnessed the same.

The Elector of Saxony, writing to Luther, June 25th, evidently before 3 o'clock, P. M., says: "On the day of John the Baptist (June 24th) we with our allies, presented ourselves before the Emperor, the King of Bohemia, the Electors and Estates, at a public meeting, and offered, in accordance with the Imperial Command, to present our Articles in Latin and German, to read publicly and deliver the German. Though we several times humbly begged to read them publicly, yet we did not succeed; for the King and the opposing party resolutely opposed it. But we have now the assurance that the Emperor will hear the Articles to-day in his Palace,—so arranged that not many persons can be present."‡

*DeWette, IV. 10, 15, 43, 44, 51.

†*Kirchengeschichtliche Studien*, p. 263.

‡German in Schirrmacher, 87–9 and in Chytraeus, p. 45b; Latin in Coelestin, I., 140. Valdesius in his History of the Diet of Augsburg (found in Cyprian, Beylagen, VII). says the Lutheran Princes wanted their Confession read publicly for the purpose of catching the popular ear. No doubt each party correctly interpreted the motive of the other.

The Nurenberg legates, writing to their Senate, June 26th, say: "Yesterday, Saturday, at 3 o'clock, P. M., the Confession of faith, as it was when we last wrote you, subscribed by the Elector, the other Princes, and in your name and in that of Reutlingen, was delivered, in Latin and German, to the Emperor in the presence of the King, the Electors, Princes and Estates, assembled in the Palace. It was first read in German before their Majesties, the Electors, Princes and Estates, by the Saxon Chancellor, Dr. Christian (Beyer), publicly and distinctly, so that all present could easily hear it. Then the Emperor, after a conference with the other Electors and Princes, announced, through Duke Frederick, to the Elector of Saxony and his allies, that his Majesty had heard the Confession. But inasmuch as the matter was somewhat lengthy, and also highly important, necessity was laid on his Majesty to consider and to counsel well over the matter,—that he would do this and would demean himself in the matter as becomes a gracious Christian Emperor, and when he shall have made up his mind on the subject, he will again summon the Elector and the Princes. For this answer and gracious hearing the Elector, Princes and allies, returned their hearty thanks to the Emperor, the King, the Electors, Princes and Estates, with the assurance that they had acted in all loyalty and friendliness; also that if his Majesty should summon them again, they would willingly appear, and not only in regard to this matter, but in regard to all of the matters of the Diet summoned by his Majesty, they would perform their duty.

"Then the Emperor, as it has since been reported to us, spoke with the Electors and Princes privately, and requested them to retain the Confession by them, and not to allow it to be printed. This they promised to do. His Majesty did not conduct himself ingraciously during this procedure. We have also heard more than one say that no objection could be found with such a confession, and some of the Electors and Princes regard it as moderate."*

We find another account of the reading of the Confession in Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, pp. 89–90. It may, or it may

*C. R. II., 142–3.

not, have been written by an eye-witness. It has the value of an original document, and as such it is here presented:

"On Saturday after John the Baptist's day, the Elector of Saxony, Duke John, Margrave George of Brandenburg, Duke John Frederick of Saxony, Duke Ernest of Brunswick and Lüneburg, Landgrave Philip of Hesse, Duke Francis of Brunswick and Lüneburg, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt, and the two cities Nurenberg and Reutlingen, had the CONFESSION of their faith and of the entire Christian doctrine that is preached in their principalities, lands and cities, publicly read in German, article by article, with Christian joyous courage and heart, and that not only in the presence of all the Electors, Princes, Estates, Bishops, Counsellors, that were present, but also before the Roman Emperor himself and his brother, King Ferdinand.

"It was read by the Saxon Chancellor, Dr. Christian, so loud and distinctly that it was heard not only in the hall, but also in the yard below, that is, in the Bishop of Augsburg's court, where the Emperor's lodgings are.

"The Confession had been composed in German and Latin, but on account of the shortness of the time it was read only in German. The Estates also promised a fuller explanation, if anything should be found lacking in the Confession, and they declared that they do not decline the council that has been so long promised and ordered."*

The room in which the reading took place was the chapel of the Augburg episcopal palace. It had capacity for about two hundred persons. At one end on a raised platform sat Charles V., richly clad, under a splendid canopy. On the right he was flanked by the Elector of Saxony followed by a long line of princes. On the left sat King Ferdinand under a small canopy, flanked by the Electors of Mayence and Cologne, the empty chair of Treves, by archbishops and bishops. In the midst of these sat Dr. John Eck. Toward the rear sat the legates of the cities and the civil counsellors. In the middle of the room sat the two imperial secretaries. The supreme moment came at four o'clock when the Princes made as though they would rise

*See an almost verbally identical account in Spalatin's *Annales*, p. 134–5.

and stand during the reading of their Confession; but the Emperor bade them sit down. Then Drs. Brück and Beyer came forward in front of the Emperor, the former holding in his hand a Latin copy of the Confession, and the latter a German copy. The Emperor asked that the Latin copy be read, but the Elector interposed and said: "We are on German soil. Therefore I hope His Majesty will also permit the German language." After a short address by Dr. Brück in the name of the Protestant Princes and Estates, the Confession was read by Dr. Beyer in the German language. The reading lasted two hours. The Emperor, the King, Princes, Bishops, and others, listened with the closest attention, though the Emperor is said to have nodded for a while. When Dr. Beyer read from the Confession that four hundred years before that time the Pope had prohibited marriage to the German priests, and that the Archbishop of Mayence had enforced the prohibition, the King asked the Archbishop of Mayence if that was true.*

After the reading Dr. Brück took both copies and was about to deliver them to Alexander Schweiss, the Imperial Secretary, to be passed to the Elector of Mayence, the Imperial Chancellor. But the Emperor reached out his hand and took both copies.† The German copy he gave to the Elector of Mayence. The Latin he retained. Both copies were originals, and both have perished; at least it is not known that either is in existence. The Latin was taken to Brussels, and thence may have been carried to Spain. The German copy is thought to have been taken to the Council of Trent, and possibly thence to Rome; but the most diligent inquiry in the Imperial Archives in Spain, and in the Vatican Library at Rome, has failed to discover a trace of either of them.

It is thus the misfortune of the Lutheran Church not to have a true, diplomatic copy of the very Confession of faith that called her into existence and gave her her distinctive life.‡

*Coelestin, II., 189; Spalatin, *Annales*, p. 139.

†Spalatin, p. 139. Brück's *Geschichte*, p. 55.

‡"In the strictest sense we do not know the wording of the 'Augustana,' and the numerous copies from the time of the Diet, show that the differen-

The Emperor commanded his Secretary, Alexander Schweiss, to translate the Confession into French and Italian, and to see that not one word was omitted in the translations, but that the whole matter be correctly expressed. Cardinal Campeggius sent a copy of the Italian version to the Pope, Clement VII. The legates of the Kings of England, France and Portugal, and the representatives of other foreign rulers, had the Confession translated into their respective languages, and sent to their Principals. "Thus it happened," says J. J. Müller, "that this Confession of faith, almost like lightning, spread in a moment from the East to the West, and was espoused, not only by individuals, but by whole nations,—yea, it shall stand not only before the Pope, but before the Devil, and before the gates of hell to the last day."*

ARTICLE IV.

FACING THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

By Rev. J. G. Butler, D. D.

We acknowledge our indebtedness for the suggestive and momentous thought of this brief paper to the Rev. Dr. James M. King, General Secretary of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions. As we face the Twentieth Century, Doctor King, in this fresh and readable volume of 640 pages, looks at our National peril chiefly from the menace to all civil and religious freedom, coming down through the centuries, with the traditional *semper eadem* assumption of the Papal Hierarchy, laying claim to temporal, spiritual and universal dominion. That is the right interpretation of the arrogated vicarship of Christ by the Pontiff at Rome. This interesting volume is a wide and timely survey of our American Institutions and civilization, of the perils which menace them and of the forces which may be depended upon to protect them. With the re-

ces in expression, though seldom in matters essential, are so many, that the hope of restoring an authentic text is very small." Prof. Kolde, *Augsburgische Konfession*, p. 10.

**Historie von der Evang. Staende*, etc., p. 588; Coelestin, II., 191b.

ligious conscience of our Roman Catholic brethren we have no controversy, nor responsibility, save to win them to the better way, and to lead them out of the darkness, amid which we doubt not many of them find Christ and pardon and peace and eternal life. God has in this historic Church a people who obey and love and serve him, but who do not yet appear to have come into the fulness of light and life as we have it in Christ Jesus. It is with the politico-religious aspects of the Herarchy that we have to do, as citizens of this Christian Republic. Doctor King emphasizes our National peril. The enlightened, patriotic and Christian people of the Nation are competent to solve righteously this and all other problems confronting us, as the years come and go. Nations, as well as individuals and families and churches, have their divinely appointed mission and destiny. The mission of free America appears to be to lead the family of nations, all of which are struggling for the freedom of truth wherewith Christ makes free, out into the fulness of freedom, which we enjoy.

Facing the Twentieth Century, we in America are solving that greatest of Christian problems—*the unity of believers*—for which our Lord prayed. In the great union organizations and works of the present day, believers are actualizing, as never in the history of the Church, the aphorism of the Reformers: In Essentials Unity; in Nonessentials liberty; in all things charity. As in nature so in grace, diversity in unity, and unity in diversity, is God's law, written everywhere. The struggle for uniformity, in the dogmatic statement of truth, in ritual or in polity, is unnatural, unscriptural, undesirable, unattainable and utopian.

With the rapidly increasing wealth of the nation, the *money problem*, in its relation to the Kingdom of God, is vital and is stirring the conscience of God's people. Gold and silver are wasted in untold millions, even among Christ's people, whilst we are giving only the crumbs to the work of the Lord. After a while we shall grow to a recognition of our Christian stewardship, and in this we will find the ultimate solution of this problem. Ye are not your own, and the gold and silver are the Lord's.

The *race problem* with its frictions and oppressions and tears

and blood; the *liquor problem*, costing us more than a billion of dollars annually, beside the terrible entailment of drunkenness and widowhood and orphanage; of pauperism and vice and crime, and insanity; the problem of the *modern city*, and how to govern it and deliver it from hydra-headed corruption, its rottenness and stench; these are among the problems that confront us as we face the twentieth century. With the rise, decline and decay of nations, from Egypt to Babylon, to Greece, to Rome, to Italy, to Spain, we may read everywhere on the crumbling ruins the confirmation of the divine word, *the nation and Kingdom that will not serve God shall perish.* As justice and righteousness are the foundation of our Republic, will it abide; it is always true, that righteousness exalteth the nation. Back of all these are other problems; atheism, materialism, and infidelity in its many forms, attack the very foundations of the faith in Christ in whom centre the world's hopes.

Dr. King, in his racy volume makes startling statements, and with the flash light of facts and of logic, uncovers an enemy, attacking with the persistency of Jesuit wisdom, the foundations of our American institutions. Whilst all who read his book, may not enter as fully as he into the alarm, which he sounds; yet there is call to thoughtful and prayerful vigilence, upon the part of all who love the Flag, and the principles of freedom and righteousness for which the flag stands. The representative religious press of the country gives unstinted commendation to Doctor King's book, the *Christian Advocate* calling it "an arsenal of weapons, an alarm bell, which ought to ring whenever by stealthy approach, or by sudden spring, the Jesuits and those whose work they do, are undermining civil liberty, delivering votes *en masse*, or disparaging, or antagonizing the public schools." Doctor Josiah Strong, author of "Our Country;" Hon. Charles K. Skinner, Sup't. of Public Schools, State of New York; Gen. Thomas J. Morgan, late U. S. Commissioner of Indian affairs; Doctor David Grigg, author of the "Makers of the American Republic," speak patriotically and heroically of our author and his book. The Roman Catholic press, of Boston and New York, we need hardly say, is unstinted in denuncia-

tion of the work of our author, advising the boycotte of *McClure's Magazine*, because of its advertisment of the book. Doctor King says, "the boycotte is everywhere essentially a Roman Catholic institution, and is extensively employed against merchants and others, who dare to advertise in papers, which fearlessly discuss facts concerning its aggression." He further says, "we are authentically informed, that many, if not most of the political daily papers in this country are under Roman censorship either by the power of political fear or by the presence on the editorial staff of some astute and watchful Roman Sentinel."

Within the limits of a brief paper, it is possible to give only a cursory glance at the statements of this very interesting and stirring volume. It certainly appeals strongly to the friends of truth, as it is in Jesus; to the eternally protesting Church; to the enemies of priestcraft and kingscraft; and to American citizens, native and adopted, who are jealous of the freedom and perpetuity of American institutions. Our Republic of freedom was born contemporaneously with our common Protestantism, in the reformation and regeneration of the 16th century. At Worms Luther stood for the world's freedom, an "Alpine Man," and the freedom thus achieved is to liberate man everywhere. Michelet, the French historian, himself a Roman Catholic, calls Luther the Liberator of Modern Thought. The rugged Carlyle designates Luther "as a mighty man, whose light was to flame as the beacon over long centuries, and epochs of the world. The whole world he added, was waiting for this man, a true great man, great in intellect, in courage, affection and integrity, a most loveable and precious man." The protest in the 16th century and the Declaration of American Independence in the 18th century are inseparably linked together in the unfolding of God's providence.

The danger of our Republic does not lie in the direction of so called Imperialism, differing as, equally honest and patriotic men may differ in regard to the expansion of National domain. The problems involved in this expansion will be wrought out, but not fully in one generation. Nations are born in a day, but it requires years and generations to work out their destiny.

But whilst we have an abiding faith in the patriotism and love of freedom instinct with American life, there is need for vigilence as we stand in the presence of a Hierarchy, whose insidious, wily and persistent purposes are traditional, and whose boast through the centuries, in her *Semper Eadem*, in dogma, in polity and in spirit, with a bloody record of 1200 years behind us, yet Rome's claim to supreme temporal, spiritual and universal dominion comes ringing down the centuries with alarming monotony. This arrogance we contest in the name of every American freeman and in the Name that is above every name; Jesus Christ alone is king, and he has no vicar. In Jesus Christ every believer is free, forever free, as his own conscience interprets his American and Christian birthright. Much as we love peace and cultivate Christian fraternity with all men, we dare not sleep in the presence of this peril. The American Constitution says, there shall be no establishment of religion and it guarantees liberty of speech and of the press to all law-abiding citizens. The Pope of Rome says: "It is the liberty of perdition."

Doctor King quotes freely from leaders of thought, men who connot be charged with religious bigotry. Let us hear some of them, *Macaulay* says: "The polity of the Church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom. * * * The experience of 1200 years, and the ingenuity of patient care of 40 generations of statesmen, have improved that polity to such perfection, that among the contrivences which have been devised for deceiving and controlling mankind, it occupies the highest place."

Froude says: "So much only can be foretold with certainty, that if the Catholic Church anywhere recovers her ascendancy, she will again exhibit the detestable features, which have invariably attended her supremacy. Her rule will be found once more incompatible either with justice or intellectual growth, and our children will be forced to recover by some fresh struggle, the ground which our forefathers conquered for us, and which we by our pusillanimity surrendered."

Mr. Gladstone says: "The Pope demands for himself the right to determine the province of his own rights, and has so defined it in formal documents, as to warrant any and every invasion of the civil sphere. * * * Against such definition of his own power there is no appeal to reason, that is rationalism; nor to Scripture, that is heresy; nor to history, that is private judgment." He adds: "No one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another."

Lord Palmerston says: "All history tells us that whenever the Romish priesthood has gained the predominance, then the utmost amount of intolerance is invariably the practice. In countries where they are in the minority, they instantly demand not only toleration, but equality; but in countries where they predominate they allow neither toleration nor equality."

Victor Hugo says: "Ah! We know You! We know the clerical party; it is an old party, this it is, which has found for the truth those two marvelous supporters, ignorance and error. This it is, which forbids to science and genius the going beyond the missel, and which wishes to cloister thought in dogmas. Every step which the intelligence of Europe has taken has been in spite of it. Its history is written in the history of human progress, but is written on the back side of the leaf. It is opposed to all." * * * "There is a book, a book which is from one end to the other an emanation from above; a book, which contains all human wisdom, illuminated by all divine wisdom, well, your censure has reached even that unheard-of-thing. Popes have proscribed the Bible! How astonishing to wise spirits! How overpowering to simple hearts! to see the finger of Rome placed upon the Book of God. Now, you claim the liberty of teaching. Stop, let us see your pupils, let us see those you have produced. What have you done for Italy! for Spain! The one in ashes the other in ruins."

Had Victor Hugo written to-day he would have given added emphasis to his powerful arraignment by adding Cuba and Porto Rico and the Philippines. What an object lesson, and the American people of all people should study it.

Looking backward, Doctor King tells us how the Hierarchy lays its hand upon the ballot box, and thwarts the will of the American people, who are Protestant in very large majority. We hear nothing of the Methodist, or Baptist, or Presbyterian, or Lutheran vote, and yet the vote of these bodies severally is about equal to the Roman Catholic vote. Only about one-eighth of our people are subjects of the Pope, and the loss to that Church, under the influence of freedom is large and constant. The Protestant vote is intelligent and independent and divided; and is not swayed by church influences. Our author tells how the Republican national platform of St. Louis was changed by a telegram from Archbishop Ireland and he gives a copy of the telegram. He also reminds us that the Chairman of the Democratic and Republican National Committees that year, were both Roman Catholic. He further says, the 16th amendment to protect public money from sectarian inroads, was defeated by Romanists in 1876; that an organized Roman Catholic lobby is maintained in this city, to secure appropriations and to influence legislation; that an undue proportion of Roman Catholics are kept in federal, state and municipal offices; that school books and cyclopedias are changed, to pervert general and American history; and how the Church has been and is opposed to our public school system. He substantiates his statements by facts and by sound reason; the whole enforced by undoubted loyalty to truth and right, as also to our free Republic, and to the coming kingdom of our Lord.

In closing this brief paper we use a paragraph from one of Doctor King's reviewers. The *Northern Christian Advocate* says:

"The author is no pessimist. He does not despair of the Republic. He believes confidently that a sovereign and sure remedy, more than equal to the malignant disease seeking to fasten itself on the giant limbs and viscera of the Nation, may be found in the benign and saving forces and powers lodged in the breasts of the American people. These he sets forth; and eloquently and solemnly invokes the co-operation of patriotic societies, all Christian churches, every individual Christian and every intelligent patriotic citizen, to the end—already so well

advanced—of forever safeguarding the bulwarks of our civil and religious liberty, by bolting and riveting their under-lying principles into the organic law of each State, and by writing the proposed XVI. Amendment into the Constitution of the United States."

This politico-ecclesiastical menace to our Republic is certainly of great moment, propably *the* one great peril, confronting us as we look into the new century. But with seven-eighths of our people non-Roman Catholics, the most intelligent and loyal citizens; with Rome herself divided and the pulsations of freedom beating strongly in the American party of that great Church, we need but arouse ourselves to patriotic duty and vigilence. Whilst we not only tolerate, but absolutely guarantee to every man absolute freedom of conscience, be he Jew or Gentile, Protestant, Roman Catholic or Pagan, this Republic is essentially and first of all, Christian, and then Protestant. The Americanism, which the non-progressive mediaeval friends of the Hierarchy deplore, and which they would destroy, is but the instinctive pulsation of the soul everywhere panting and struggling for the freedom which truth brings, and which, through the liberated Gospel, is yet to make the world free from all kingcraft and priestcraft, making every believer in Christ Jesus a king and a priest unto God forever and ever. Long live the Republic. God and truth are marching on.

ARTICLE V.

INFANT MEMBERSHIP.

By Rev. W. H. Dolbeer, A. M.

The Lutheran Church believes and teaches that the commission given to the Apostles "to disciple all nations" is not only a command, but also a promise to the Christian and to his children. She holds, that, as to the natural, so to the spiritual descendents of Abraham, God has made an abiding covenant and promise in the words, "For the promise is unto you, and to your children."

The commission in Matt. 28 : 19, 20, reads: "Go ye therefore and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Now the thing commanded is, "make disciples;" the process or means used is, "baptizing" and "teaching."

We therefore believe, that, by virtue of the commission and the promise, our children have a right to Christian baptism, and by that baptism they receive the seal of a covenant relation to God. That covenant relation is membership in his kingdom or Church.

It will be seen at a glance that the doctrines, "Infant Baptism" and "Infant Membership," are very closely allied. It is difficult to discuss the latter without drifting into a discussion of the former. Let us try to avoid this. We desire, however, to emphasize the fact that with the large majority, yes, nearly the whole of all Christendom, we believe in Infant Baptism. We have examined the arguments *pro* and *con*, and are sure that we have just grounds, Biblical and historical, for the practice of such baptism. We have sought to act intelligently in the practice of this rite, and baptize our children, not, as is sometimes intimated, because we are ignorant, but because of intelligent examination of the sources of knowledge upon this subject.

Baptism is that sacrament which was ordained as the initiatory rite inducting into the covenant relationship which constitutes membership in the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is the sign and seal of that covenant relationship. There is no question in our minds that the children of believers are proper subjects for such membership, and much in the word of God warrants our faith.

We have to deal simply with the fact and what that fact involves.

In the first place, then, let us examine into the source of this fact, the origin of infant church membership.

It is an accepted fact in the Lutheran Church that the "Word of God" is the one complete and final authority on any matter which it defines. To us, an appeal to any thing as authority which differs from that holy word—as for instance the reason—carries no weight. The Augsburg Confession derives all its importance from the fact that it is an adopted statement of a wonderfully unique conception of the meaning and scope of the Scriptures.

The word established infant membership. Some one may say, "Yes, we know it did in the Jewish Church." We are glad so much is granted. Now let us find what relation exists between the Jewish Church and the Christian Church. There are those who regard them as wholly distinct. The Scriptures themselves are the best authority on the question.

While it is conceded by all that infant membership was an obligatory institution in the Jewish Church, there are those who say that that Church with all that pertained thereto has passed away, and therefore its laws and practices can have no bearing upon the subject. They say, and truly, that we are not under the Law but under the Gospel. And they appeal, in support of their position, to such passages as Heb. 8th, 9th and 10th chapters. For instance, Heb. 8 : 13, says: "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." The writer of Hebrews, however, in these chapters fully defines just what he means by this covenant which is waxing old, and vanishing

away. It is the law with all the Tabernacle ceremonies and priestly offices. He demonstrates that these pass away by merging every principle into Christianity. In passing from Judaism to Christianity the Church lost nothing but the formal types. The types have vanished because they were types, and that which they foreshadowed has come. Every item of legal service was prophetic of Christ and his Church. We grant that the law is done away by and in Christ. But there is something in the Christian Church to take the place of everything in the law. Every type in the law finds a fulfillment in the gospel, and the very principle of all truth and practice under the law passes on into the Church under the gospel. So that infant membership does not necessarily pass away with the law.

We, however, are not dependent upon the law for infant church membership. It was made obligatory under the law, but was not instituted by the law, for it preceded that almost half a thousand years. It was instituted when God first chose a separate family to be his own peculiar people, his Church, and upon the identical basis of membership—as required in the Christian Church, *i. e.*, righteousness through faith. God imputed the righteousness to Abraham because of his faith, and thereupon made an everlasting covenant with him and his descendents. The rite inducting into that covenant was circumcision, the covenant relation was church membership, and infants were admitted into that covenant formally at eight days of age. This covenant is called the "covenant of promise," as in it God made a great promise to Abraham, and sealed that promise to him and to his children by circumcision. When God promised Abram that his descendents should be as numerous as the stars it is said in Gen. 15 : 6: "And he believed the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness."

In the 17th chapter of Gen., we are told that God renewed his promise to Abram, changing his name to Abraham. At the same time God repeatedly called this a covenant, an everlasting covenant, saying, "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy

seed after thee." (God had made the covenant, now he says, "I will establish." When did God establish that covenant? The question will be answered later.) Then follows the institution of circumcision, Gen. 17 : 9-13. "And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised. * * * And it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." Concerning this, Paul in Rom. 4 : 11-13, says: "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith which he had being yet uncircumcised that he might be the father of all them that believe though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also; and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised. For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." This shows that in the passing of the law the Abrahamic covenant was not affected. And while the form of the seal and token of that covenant changed with the advent of the Christian Church, the reason for the sealing still remains exactly the same, *i. e.*, righteousness through faith. On this ground the covenant was sealed then to infant children of believers, and likewise is it sealed to them now.

But the most positive and explicit declaration of this truth is found in Paul's epistle to the Galatians, 3 : 6, to close of chapter. This passage very plainly shows that the complete intent of the Abrahamic covenant is accomplished in Christ. Paul argues that the law coming in four hundred and thirty years

after, could not disannul that covenant. Perhaps some Galatians taught, as do some people to-day, that the whole Old Testament had become of no effect. But Paul shows otherwise, and in so doing explains the relation existing between the Abrahamic covenant, the law and Christianity. The Abrahamic covenant and the Christian covenant he construes to be one and the same, except that the latter is the completeness, the fulness of that covenant of promise. Not the fulfillment as with the law, but fulness of it. He demonstrates that such was the design of that first covenant. And he answers the question as to how and when God established the covenant which he had made with Abraham, saying: "That covenant was confirmed before in Christ." And again: "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." To the infants of the families of Abraham's seed belonged the right of the seal and token of the covenant. So the apostle regarded the Christian as an heir under or according to the promise made to Abraham in the 17th chapter of Genesis. Christ is the one great seed or descendant confirming the covenant made to Abraham, Gal. 3 : 16, 17, confirming it to the followers of Jesus Christ. It is by this means that the blessing of Abraham comes on the Gentiles, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith, Verse 14. And in the midst of the concluding verses of the chapter, where the apostle has so plainly defined the relation of Christianity to that covenant which instituted infant membership, he say: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." But why this brief reference to baptism in the midst of an argument showing the unity of the Abrahamic and Christian covenants? Because baptism sustains the same relation to the Christian annunciation of that covenant that circumcision did to the Abrahamic annunciation of the same covenant. The form of the covenant is one, namely, of promise. The end is one, namely, imputed righteousness. The condition is the same, namely, faith. The subjects are the same, namely, the cove-

nanted people of God, the Church. The form of the seal and token alone has changed from the type of the blood to the type of the spiritual working of the gospel; from that which could apply only to the male, to the needs of the gospel which knows neither male nor female; from circumcision to baptism. And the stage of the covenant has advanced from the promise to the consummation of the promise. God has, in Christ Jesus, established his covenant made with Abraham. By so doing he has not limited its scope to a narrower range, and taken its sign from a large class of those to whom it was originally given; but rather has he confirmed it to them.

No doubt the apostle is correct in his view of the relation of the Abrahamic and Christian dispensations, for he wrote by inspiration. The Church of God through all this time is one, a unit. Look at Rom. 11 : 17–30, where the Church is compared to a tame olive tree, of which the Jews are the natural branches, some of them cut off because of unbelief, and Gentiles are wild olive branches graft into this same tame olive tree by faith. But the trunk of this tree is one and the same. The trunk bears the branches, not the branches the trunk. And in verse 27 the apostle shows us that he has in mind this same covenant.

In Eph. 2nd chapter the Gentiles are spoken of as being "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the covenant of promise." Now we who were thus strangers and foreigners to this people of the covenant "are brought nigh by the blood of Christ." Nigh to what? Why, to the covenant of faith, and to the believers therein. And we are made fellow-citizens in the commonwealth of the children of Abraham by faith, namely, the saints, the household of the children of God. As the Apostle says, "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom *all the building* fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord." Here again we see the people of the covenant, the kingdom of the saints, the house-

hold of believers, all the building on the one foundation, growing from the day of the Abrahamic promise, and still growing as the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ unto an holy temple in the Lord.

We might refer with profit to other passages, but these are sufficient. They assure us that there is a stability, perpetuity and unity in the Church of our Lord once established upon earth.

Now, as we have seen, infant membership was ordained under the Abrahamic covenant. That covenant finds its true scope and development with the advent of Christ and under the Christian dispensation. In all the writings of the New Testament there is not one word, jot or tittle, which can be properly construed into a repeal of the command given to Abraham in Gen. 17 : 12, ordaining infant membership. There is enough said to cause baptism to supersede circumcision, but nothing changing the age of discipleship. While Christ does not say, in so many words, that infants should be formally received into the Church, yet, if it had not been so intended, it would have been necessary emphatically and positively to repeal the already universal practice. Had he not wished infant membership to continue, as it naturally would and did, he would have countermanded the rite long before ordained, or would have instructed the apostles to do so. Silence here most certainly gives consent, and has the force of a commandment. This fact, taken in connection with this other fact that infant membership is in perfect accord with the spirit and letter of the New Testament, gives us an invincible basis for our faith.

The sign and seal of the covenant as to its form has changed, but not the covenant. The covenant has advanced a step, and so has the sign, but nowhere has anything pertaining thereto been repealed. By this advance the covenant has certainly not been restricted in its intent and operation. The handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, has been blotted out and taken out of the way. Col. 2. That is, the ceremonial law, that which is fulfilled in the cross, or nailed to the cross; but the spiritual work of Christ, the putting away

of sins he calls the circumcision of Christ: The baptismal renewing, which separates the Christian from a sinful life. Let us give his language, Col. 2 : 11, 12: "In whom also are ye circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raisen him from the dead." This shows conclusively the relation of the two forms of the token of the covenant. The same promise attends both, and it is to you and your children.

Now since, in addition to these things, we find that the apostles and the early Church discipled infants by baptism as the Jews had done by circumcision, we have full assurance that God designed the continuation of infant membership in his Church. We have the best historic evidence of those times that the Church administered the seal of discipleship to the children of believers.

Justin Martyr, born about A. D. 89, and writing in defense of the Christians about A. D. 150, speaking of those, then members of the Church, says: "A part of them are sixty or seventy years old, who were made disciples to Christ from their infancy." That is, these had received the seal of the covenant, baptism, long before the time of the death of John the evangelist, while they were infants, and from that time on they were disciples of Christ.

Irenaeus, born about the year 97, a disciple of Polycarp, who in turn was a disciple of John, says: "Christ came to save all persons who by him are born unto God, infants and little ones, and children, and youth and elder persons." Now the expression, "Born unto God," was at that time used to denote discipleship and membership by baptism. Irenaeus is so explicit that there can be no doubt as to the ages of the classes mentioned. Infants and little ones and children were discipled.

Origin, born A. D. 185, the most learned man of his time, and who has quoted so profusely from the New Testament that it might be restored almost or quite entire from his writings, in a controversy about original sin, said: "According to the usage

of the Church, baptism is given even to infants, when if there were nothing in infants which needed forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would not seem to be necessary." Again, he says: "Infants are baptized for the remission of sins, etc., etc." And again: "For this cause it was that the Church received an order from the apostles to give baptism to infants." This shows conclusively that it was the common practice at that day to disciple infants.

As to whether infants should or should not be discipled to Christ by baptism was never made a question in the early Church. Tertullian advocated the delaying of baptism because he conceived that it washed away actual sins. He looked upon it as a laving act, not as a state of grace. He recommended even to adult believers and converts to delay their baptism, claiming that it should be put off till the day of death if possible. But he says: "If an infant is sickly or likely to die, baptize it." And his writings are conclusive as to the practice and prevalence of infant discipleship at the close of the second century and the early part of the third. He seemed to think people could be discipled to Christ without the seal and sign of discipleship. He is quoted against the doctrine, but if quoted fully he simply proves its existence. He advocated an innovation upon the established practice of his day, but failed to bring any considerable number over to his position.

In the year 254 A. D., at a council consisting of sixty-six bishops, and presided over by the learned Cyprian, in response to the question as to whether the rite of baptism should be delayed until the eighth day, it was unanimously decided that it should not be so delayed, that "even infants newly born are not to be kept from baptism and the grace of God."

Much more might be adduced to show that during the first several centuries of the Christian Church infant discipling was prevalent. This much we feel warranted in saying, that during the times of the apostles and church fathers the Church universally brought the infants into the fold of the Church by baptizing them. If it had not been so, the attempt to introduce the practice at that time would have caused very bitter debate and

opposition, and would have left abundant evidence in the writings of the times. We might hear to this late day the reverberation of the conflict as we hear the sound of Luther's hammer ringing against the church door in Wittenberg. But there was no such conflict. The very silence of the writings of that early period in the Church, and the fact that this doctrine is seldom refered to except in support of arguments on other questions, proves its unquestioned existence. Those who claim infant membership was introduced later by a degenerate Church should at least have the delicacy to remember that they have no patent-right upon history. There are not wanting among us those who can make original research along this line, and we are fully persuaded that the apostles and their successors made disciples of infants, baptizing them. There has never been a time since the Abrahamic covenant was made that there was not infant membership in the Church, unless it was during the persecution at the time Moses was born, when Israelitish mothers had to hide their male children to save them. And perhaps even then the practice was not wholly obliterated. There may also be one or two other occasions when it was shamefully neglected, but not by all. And in all this long space of history there has never been a time when God did not acknowledge infant membership by imparting his grace to those so discipled as well as to any others; and we believe his grace to them has been more abundant.

So much for the fact of infant membership.

Now out of this fact arise questions of great importance to the Church. Three propositions will cover the ground, though time forbids we should discuss them fully.

1st. The state of the infant disciple.

2nd. The rights and privileges of the child so discipled.

3rd. The duties of the Church to the children within the fold.

1. The state of the infant disciple.

Objectively he is of the household of believers. Subjectively he is in a state of faith. Not faith as held by an adult believer, but the germ, the primary ground of such faith. The means of

grace are channels for communicating grace when they are used according to divine provision. It is reasonable, that as an infant of man is subject to natural law, so an infant of believers is a subject for grace, and by the use of this means of grace becomes a subject of the law of grace The words of Paul in Titus 3 : 5, now have a deeper meaning: "But according to his mercy he saves us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." This Scripture, in view of the fact that the apostles taught the Church to continue infant membership, is significant. That system of theology which would restrict the operations of God's grace to mature years is wholly arbitrary. Infancy is not a state of negation, but of receptivity, and in a state of receptivity alone does the Holy Ghost operate in any heart. Because of this capacity for receiving blessing Jesus lays his hands on little children and prays. Mat. 19 : 13–15. And in Mark 10 : 15 he says: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." And in Mark 9 : 42 : "And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea." Let us keep in mind that these children were little ones in their mother's arms, and the zealous disciples thought to rebuke the mothers for bringing them. Christ taught those disciples by this act that those children were susceptible of his blessing and grace, and it should not be denied them. And we therefore find Paul in 1 Cor. 7 : 14, saying: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the (*believing*) wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the (*believing*) husband; else were your children unclean; but now they are holy." "Unclean," is a state of pollution or sin unremoved by appointed means; "holy," is a state of consecration secured by the use of means and the acceptance of conditions which God has appointed. The terms, when referring to religious conditions are universally so used. The apostle makes a very positive distinction between children of unbelievers and believers, saying the children of Christian parents are holy. They are set apart, dedicated by appointed means for divine

purposes. Yet there are those who would have us believe that the children of believers and those of unbelievers are on identically the same ground and in the same state as to grace; that they are either all clean, or else all unclean. Baptism is, as circumcision was, the seal of the covenant of righteousness by faith. The baptized child is set apart by the appointed means of grace for this life of faith. Your children are not unclean, but holy.

This is not a conclusion of the reason, nor by the reason, but by and through revelation. Hence when we attempt to explain the "How" we are as much at a loss as when we try to explain the processes of any of the great mysteries, as that of "God manifest in the flesh," the operation of the Holy Spirit, or Christ's presence in the Supper. We accept this as true that the Holy Spirit, working faith in whomsoever he will, does work in the receptive soul of an infant set apart for Christ, such grace as is needful for that child, and the beginning of a future, broader, deeper, more mature faith in the disciple's after life. As the apostle concluded that the Jew had great advantage over the Gentile, and there was much profit in circumcision because to the Jew was committed the oracles of God, and advantage in every other way also, so we can justly conclude that there is much advantage and profit to the child of believing parents, which by virtue of its parentage has right to the household of faith, and has under this right received the seal which signifies "Holiness unto the Lord," "The righteousness of faith," "An heir of the promise."

2nd. The child so discipled has certain rights and privileges in the Church. It has, however, not the communicant rights of maturer years. We need not state here why this is so. The child is to be regarded as consecrated, dedicated, set apart in the household of God for a holy life, to be looked upon as the discipled child of the Lord Jesus. He is on the inside, not the outside. He is the subject of grace, not simply a subject for grace. He is not the child of the world and the devil, with a preponderance in favor of serving them; but he is clean, holy, of the household of faith and a child of God. As such he has

indisputable claims upon the Church, and a very definite place therein. He has been admitted into the nursery of the Church. He shares with other members its blessings and promises. He belongs to a great family which is named after Christ. We have a not inapt illustration in this: The infants in our homes are just as truely members of the family, subjects and citizens of the State as we elder ones; so the children in the Church are fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God, sharing his manifold grace.

3rd. In turn the Church, and the parent in the Church, is in duty bound to so direct and nurse the religious life already begun in the child at its baptism that it may grow up with the full abiding blessing of that grace. We rejoice that there are lambs in the fold. A lamb of a week is not less a lamb than one of three months. It may not be as large. They, belonging to the great fold of the Master, and enclosed in the same enclosure, are to be fed. "Feed my lambs." Here a great responsibility rests upon the Church. Had it fully discharged its obligation here, probably the doctrine of infant membership would never have been called in question. The Church must learn to discharge its duty to the lambs. But while there has been great neglect in this branch of church work, we must call attention to the fact that we never hear intelligent Lutherans say of the religious life of their children: "Oh we thought we would not say anything to them about it, but have decided to let them go till they are old enough to act in this matter for themselves." That is an expression every American pastor hears, but never among those who have conscientiously, prayerfully given their children to God by the right of baptism. We do wrong when we shift responsibility, and leave it for conversion to do what God intended we should do for the child. The Church needs more nursing fathers and nursing mothers.

This discipling of our infants is very useful in that it gives us assurance that the religious blessings we enjoy are guaranteed to our children. We are encouraged to take greater interest in their religious growth because God has given them a place in

the fold. We also have the advantage of keeping before the mind of the child the fact that he is already a child of God, a fact which we have found naturally pleasing to the young just as they are pleased to think of themselves as young Americans, and they learn the former sooner than the latter.

And so may our children in the fullest sense ever be the children of our Father which is in heaven: "Discipled unto the Lord from their infancy."

ARTICLE VI.

IN A JAPANESE HOME AT NEW YEAR.

By Rev. R. B. Peery, Ph. D.

Some years ago, on an invitation of a Japanese friend, who was at that time a student in Tokyo, I visited him in his home, and spent the New Year holidays there. My friend's father, Mr. Masuda, is a well-to-do merchant in the growing town of Takasaki, about three hours journey by rail from Tokyo. It is an interesting Christian household, and the opportunity of visiting in it was a welcome privilege, the pleasure of which was greatly enhanced by the fact that the visit came just at the New Year Festival—the most brilliant and popular of all Japanese festivals.

On the last day of the old year I accompanied my student friend to his home, and was duly presented to his father, mother, and sister—O Yone san. Mr. Masuda was a grave, kind-looking man past middle life; his wife was one of those sweet motherly old women who know how to make all around them comfortable; and O Yone san was a pretty girl of twenty summers, as sweet and bewitching as maidens are everywhere. As the friend of their son and brother, I was given a warm welcome, and made to feel quite at home.

Seeing the great pride my hosts felt in their son, and their joy of having him back with them, gave me a feeling of kinship to them. O Yone san was very proud of her big brother, who treated her with as much kindness and consideration as if she

had been his sweetheart. They formed a happy reunited family; and I was generously given a place in its sacred circle.

The preparations that had been diligently made for the festival so soon to begin were in evidence on every hand. The interior of the house was as clean and bright as a new dollar; while the picturesque little garden had been strewn with fresh white sand, and was cleanly swept and arranged in perfect order. The front gate was beautifully ornamented by a large arch of evergreen, over which hung an artistic straw cable, with an orange, a dried persimmon, a red lobster, and a bit of charcoal tied in the center. The cabel is expected to keep the devils out for a whole year, and the articles attached to it are expected to bring long life and good fortune. O Yone san took me out to the kitchen and showed me a large supply of *mochi* she and the servants had prepared for the occasion. There it was in a great pile—small round cakes made of rice flour and beans, in various colors. Everybody is expected to eat *mochi* at this season, and it is said to give strength and courage for the battles of the new year.

In a little while supper wus announced, and we all seated ourselves in a semi-circle on the soft mats, in the best room. Little tables about one foot square and six inches high were brought in and one was placed before each person; then nice lacquer bowls containing dainty bits of fish, eggs, and vegetables were placed on them; and a small tub of steaming hot rice was set down in front of us. A delicious evening meal it was! and we did it full justice. Noticing that O Yone san served the rice with her own hands, although there were plenty of servants in the house, I made bold to ask the reason, when Mr. Masuda replied, with a fine piece of sentiment: "I always have my daughter wait on me at meals, as the rice seems to taste better from her hands."

When supper was ended and our Lilliputian tables were all taken away my host said, thoughtfully: "Well, another year has gone, and we enter upon a new one to-morrow. It has been a hard year to most of us, but, by the blessing of God, I have been able to balance up my accounts and pay off all the

old debts; and now I can enter upon the new year with a clean record."

"Is it customary in your country to settle up old business and pay off all debts at the end of the year?" I asked. "Yes, indeed," he replied, "it is the great aim of every man to begin the new year unencumbered; and if he cannot do so there is no real joy in his heart on New Year Day, although he must put on a happy exterior, and receive the congratulations of his friends with a smiling face."

There is a very pretty Japanese custom of holding a watch-meeting on New Year's eve, bidding farewell to the old year and welcoming the new. The Christian people have adapted these meeting to their own need, and generally hold a beautiful little service just at midnight. My host said there was to be such a service in the chapel to which he belongs, and invited me to accompany the family to it. We set out at 11 P. M., and after a brisk walk in the cool night air, under a full moon, in due time we arrived at the chapel. It was an ordinary residence such as are frequently used for chapels here, with mats for a floor, paper partitions, and a roof of straw. Going inside, we found a party of twelve or fifteen men and women seated on the soft clean mats, with a little *hibachi*, or fire-box, in front of each one. The evangelist sat at the upper end of the room—a serious, thoughtful man of perhaps fifty years.

Promptly at 11.30 the service began by the singing of a suitable hymn; after which a short Scripture lesson was read and an earnest prayer offered. Then the evangelist, still sitting in familiar fashion among his flock, made a plain practical talk, reviewing the past year, and especially dwelling upon the manifold favors of God to the Church, the nation, and to most of us as individuals. He exhorted each one, very earnestly, to review his past life, confess his sins unto God, and begin the new year with a clear conscience and a deeper consecration to the Master. The occasion lent impressiveness to the talk, and all were visibly moved by it. The minute hand of the clock was drawing near to 12, and two or three short prayers were called for during the remaining minutes. The responses were prompt and sincere.

Suddenly the town clock began, slowly and deliberately, sounding the knell of the old year; and while its solemn tones were ringing in our ears we all, with united voice, breathed forth the Lord's Prayer, and the meeting was done. Then followed sincere congratulations and best wishes for the new year; after which the people quietly dispersed to their homes.

We were all up early next morning, and every one was dressed in his best clothes and wore his sweetest smile—for of all days in the year this must be the most cheerful and happy. Notwithstanding the season, the sun shone warm and bright, and it was a glorious day. Breakfast was dispatched in a hurry, and Mr. Masuda and his son, each taking a huge pile of cards, started off to pay their New Year calls—for every one must call on every one else in Japan on New Year's Day. O Yone san brought a fine screen and set it across the hall in front of the entrance; then she placed a rich mat before it, and put a silver card plate on the mat to receive the cards of those who should call.

Having no calls to make myself, I went out on the street to see what was going on on the outside. A bright and varied scene awaited me. The whole town was in holiday attire; and all was bustle, hubbub, and confusion. These people are generally slow and deliberate in their movements; but on this particular morning I found them as wide awake as Yankees, running here, there, and everywhere, as fast as their short legs would carry them. People were hurrying back and forth through the streets like bees in a hive; and all were gay and happy, faces that had been long and sour for months being now radiant with smiles. All the shops were closed—something which I have never seen on any other day of the year here,—and a national flag was waving from each house, the bright red suns looking very pretty in their setting of spotless white. Large arches of evergreen, or small living pine trees, ornamented each gate; and wildly happy little children, in gorgeous red robes, were playing around them, in high glee. It was a brilliant scene, such as can be witnessed nowhere else than in Japan, and even here only on New Year's morning.

After gazing on this lively street scene for a while, I returned to the house. I noticed that the card plate was already full to overflowing, and every few minutes some one rushed in, threw one more card on the pile, and hurried away. I was surprised to see little boys coming and leaving their cards, along with the men. In this ever-flowing stream of people there were no ladies; they must stay at home to receive guests for the first day, and make their calls later. Most of the callers simply left their cards, but occasionally an intimate friend of the family came inside and offered his congratulations in person. The usual formularies were as follows:

"This is a splendid New Year! I offer my congratulations."

"Thank you. It is a capital New Year!"

"Last year I received countless favors from you, and I pray that you will continue them throughout the new year also."

"No, positively, it is I who was helped by you. Please favor me with your august assistance this year, too."

Some very polite bows, and the caller is gone; only to be followed by others, who say the same things in turn. It used to be the custom for every one to come into the house and make a long call, but the habit of simply leaving the card has largely supplanted that in recent years.

Mr. Masuda and his son came in at a late dinner hour, looking as if they had been in a walking-race. And with good reason, for they had visited more than two hundred friends and acquaintances during the forenoon; but they took it all as a matter-of-course, and were smiling and happy over it.

For dinner we had a big feast in honor of the day, and the special dish was *mochi.* Each one ate as much as he could of it, thus laying up strength for use during the year. While the meal was in progress Mr. Masuda turned to me and said:

"We have all taken hold of another year now, and are one year older than we were yesterday. I believe you count differently in your country, but with us the New Year is everybody's birthday."

"How is that?" I asked. "We call a child one year old when

it is born, and two at the next New Year; then it takes one more year each New Year thereafter."

In the afternoon my friends again went out to complete their calls. The pile of cards at our own front door kept growing larger and larger, and this continued for two days. Finally the mania of calling seemed to exhaust itself, and the card plate was removed.

On the morning of the second day postal cards began to come in from friends at a distance, bearing congratulations by mail. These cards came from all parts of the Empire, wherever the family had friends. It is considered very impolite not to present congratulations at this season, and if it cannot be done in person custom requires that it be done through the mails.

I was much interested in the presents my hosts received on this occasion. The grocer, the butcher, the vegetable dealer, all brought substantial presents, and solicited the custom of the house for the new year. Several fine large fish were received from friends—fish being the regulation present of the season.

The holiday ended with a great feast, to which all friends of the family, and the clerks in Mr. Masuda's employ, were invited. After that the people gradually settled down to their former ways.

This New Year Festival, as I experienced it in the home of my friend, was almost romantic, and it was with a pang of regret that I saw it pass, and bade my kind entertainers farewell.

ARTICLE VII.

THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.

By Rev. Adam Stump, A. M.

Rich as our Symbols are in theological statement, they nowhere attempt a scientific definition of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. The Augustana does not contain an article on the subject. None of the symbolical books presents any formal dicta on this theme. We do not find our doctrine on this lately-mooted question in ready-made credal propositions, but we must arrive at it by the inductive method of reasoning. Our fundamental Confession refers to it only incidentally. The nature of our proof must be circumstantial, but from that very fact all the stronger. What is taught by undesigned implication has greater force than the most studied and accurate verbal formulary.

Our present task therefore is to prove from the Lutheran symbols, and especially from the Augustana, that it is the faith of the Lutheran Church, that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," and that "the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but, holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Tim. 3 : 16; 2 Peter 1 : 21.

As a working definition, we accept that of the Standard Dictionary, which *sub verbo* says: "Supernatural divine influence exerted upon the sacred teachers and writers by the Spirit of God by which divine authority was given to their writings."

For purposes of orthodoxy this broad statement is sufficient. To place ourselves on a par with the strictest inspirationists it would not be necessary to prove more. That definition contains all that is necessary, both to the theological and to the scientific side of the subject.

It will, of course, not be contended that the exact nature and manner of this divine inbreathing are necessary to the definition of inspiration. After the finest analysis, there will remain some-

thing that we cannot understand. However, for the clearness of thought, we will mention the various theories of inspiration that have been held and are still being advocated, by some. Certain of these theories contradict each other; others do not. All of them are only the teachings of men; yet are they not, on that account, to be treated with contempt.

First comes the mechanical theory. According to this the sacred writer simply was an antomaton, a machine manipulated by the divine hand. The human element was entirely passive. The man did absolutely nothing, God everything. But Dr. Charles Hodge says: "The ancients, indeed, were accustomed to say, as some theologians also have said, that the sacred writers were as pens in the hands of the Spirit; or as harps, from which he drew what sounds he pleased. These representations were, however, intended simply to illustrate one point, namely, that the words uttered or recorded by inspired men were the words of God. The Church has never held what has been stigmatized as the mechanical theory of inspiration." (Sys. Theol., Vol. I., p. 156.)

Secondly, the verbal theory. According to this not only the concepts or ideas of the Scriptures, but even the very words were inspired. Although these words may not have been dictated by the Spirit, nevertheless since those who spoke or wrote them were at the moment under the divine afflatus, their language really became the language of God. Consequently the original manuscripts in the chirography of the prophets and apostles were, no doubt, *verbatim et literatim*, the words of God. But as we no longer possess these, our present copies of the holy oracles, though sufficiently reliable, are not any more perfectly accurate.

Thirdly, the moral theory. This is rather a too general term. By it is meant that the inspired writers were infallibly guided only with reference to moral and religious truths. While recording history or stating facts of science, as it was in their day, they were left to themselves, but when stating matters of divine revelation, they were guided by the omniscient mind. This is,

no doubt, partly true, but it is not the whole truth. As a theory it raised more questions than it answers. According to this notion, we would have only a partially inspired Bible.

Fourthly, the dynamical theory. On this subject Dr. Brown's notes are so clear that we will simply quote his words: "That the Holy Spirit employed men's faculties according to natural laws, and that the writers contributed somewhat to the divine record. * * * Those who admit only the divine must ignore what is found everywhere in the Sacred Word; viz., diversity of thought, style, manner of presenting the truth, and must advance an indefensible theory. And those who admit only the human have no guarantee against error. Both elements must be maintained, as both the divine and human are so clearly exhibited in the Bible itself."

In agreement with this setting forth of the theory, Dr. Valentine uses the following illustration: "Just as in nature in plant and tree, the principle of life, when annexed to certain portions of matter exhibits its vital energy in accordance with the conditions which that matter imposes, while it governs and directs, at the same time, the organism with which it is combined, so the Holy Spirit, animating and manifesting his power in and through the human instrument, displays his influence in harmony with the laws of mental action." (Lectures.)

Fifthly, we will yet glance at the plenary theory of inspiration. In modern times this terminology seems to be most universally adopted as best expressing the conviction of the Christian Church. Plenary is opposed to partial and conveys the idea that the *theopneustic* influence was extended to all the books and to every part of each book in the Bible. The inspiration is so complete that nothing is wanting. The human elements are not ignored. Yet the great book is not the product of the gradual development of the world's most gifted geniuses, but is an authentic record of a series of divine revelations to mankind.

Though this list does not exhaust the entire catalogue of modified theories, it presents the salient points of all. But we are now concerned, not for a theory, but about the fact of inspi-

ration. Has God spoken from heaven, and is the voice of prophecy his voice? Are the memoirs of the evangelist and the epistles of the apostles, and of their coadjutors, the messages of the Father to his children? But, above all, does the Lutheran Church so teach?

We will first gather the material and then state the argument, which is the same thing as first collecting the evidence and afterwards formulating it. We shall regard the Augsburg Confession as the only confessional authority in the discussion. The testimony of the other symbols and the teachings of our theologians we shall regard only in the light of corroborative and cumulative proof. Commentaries never can take the place of originals, and therefore they prove but little.

Previous to any positive declaration of our Church's faith in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, there should be a presumption that such is the Lutheran view, from the fact that Lutherans give the Bible the highest place of authority. To them "the word of God, as contained in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments," is "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." It should be taken for granted that a body of people, who thus exalt a book, must esteem it as being more than human.

This presumption, which a stranger could reasonably base upon the General Synod's introduction to our Confession, receives added force from the language of the "Preface to the Emperor Charles V," which the fathers read at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530: "We now offer in the matter of religion the Confession of our preachers and of ourselves, the doctrine of which derived from the Holy Scriptures and pure Word of God, and they have to this time set forth in our lands, dukedoms, domains, and cities, and taught in our churches." (Jacobs' Book of Concord, p. 34.)

As far as the General Synod is concerned, this question is once and for all time settled in Section 3 of Preliminary Principles, in Chapter I. of the Formula for Government and Discipline: "We believe that such a revelation God has given, at sundry times and in diverse manners, unto the fathers, and in

later days by his Divine Son, Jesus Christ, and his inspired servants; that this revelation is contained in the books known in Protestant Christendom as the Old and New Testaments." The same is true of the General Council, whose professors declare, at their investiture: "I believe that the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments are given by inspiration of God." (Conservative Reformation, p. 164.)

No doubt all the Lutheran constitutions of the world contain similar confessional principles. But this fact alone would not make an examination of our great *Magna Charta*, or general creed, unnecessary. The Augsburg Confession is at once the basal and universal document of Lutheran authority as to doctrine, and, if this fails us, our claim to faith in the inspiration of the Bible can not be made good. If the fountain is not pure, the stream that flows from it cannot be pure, or, if the foundation is not sure, the superstructure that is built upon it cannot stand. This is a fundamental axiom.

In the article (IV.), "Of Justification," the confessors include the third and fourth chapters of Romans as the ground of the doctrine and really as a part of the document. "Of the Ministerial Office" they say: "In order that we may obtain this faith, the ministry has been instituted for teaching the gospel and administering the sacraments. For through the instrumentality of the word and sacraments, the Holy Spirit is given, who, when and where it pleases God, works faith in those who hear the gospel." (Art. V.) "Concerning New Obedience" (VI.), they quote the text: "When ye shall have done all those things, say, we are unprofitable servants" (Luke 17 : 10). In Article VII., they declare: "But the Church is the congregation of the saints, in which the gospel is correctly taught," and in Article VIII., "and on account of the appointment and command of Christ, both the word and sacraments are efficacious, even when administered by wicked men."

"Of Confession" (XI.) they aver that it is impossible to enumerate all our offences, and quote the Psalmist: "Who can understand his errors?" (Psa. 19 : 12).

"Of the Cause of Sin" (XIX.), concerning the devil they quote

the words of Christ: "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own" (John 8 : 44). In the article of "Good Works" (XX.) the following passages are cited: "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14 : 6). "Ye are saved by grace, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God" (Eph. 2 : 8). "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God" (Rom. 5 : 1). In the conclusion of Part I. of the Confession they say: "This is about the sum of our doctrines, from which it is evident, that they contain nothing inconsistent with the Scriptures."

After in the same manner finding their footing on Scripture in Part II., on "Abuses Corrected," as numerous citations would show, their final sentence concerning the entire Confession exhibited in the following: "If anyone should find defects in it, we hold ourselves ready to furnish him with additional information, on the ground of the divine and holy Scriptures."

Having now the data in hand we are able to state our arguments in favor of the opinion that the confessional or credal manifesto of the Lutheran Church teaches the doctrine of inspiration as generally understood.

This is proven by the very absence of an article on this point. The enemies of the Reformers had left no stone unturned to bring accusations against them. They were charged with every imaginable heresy. They were condemned for ignoring or at least subordinating tradition, but no one was foolish enough to doubt their belief in the divine inspiration of the Holy Book. That was taken for granted, though likely unconsciously. The subject perhaps never came into mind. It was not necessary. Hence, though the word "inspiration" does not occur, in its technical sence, except as as a quotation from Scripture, in any of our symbols, its very absence is proof and not disproof, that the doctrine of inspiration forms the background, the very *sine qua non*, of the Augsburg Confession. Its silence is more eloquent than words could possibly be. The position of the Apostles' Creed, under similar circumstances, is not any more unquestionable. As is evident from the specimens given in this paper, the Reformers indulged in many direct quotations from the Bible; but its general language is also so thoroughly sur-

charged with biblical thought, that its very ambient atmosphere is like an emenation from the sacred oracles. It is full of the electrical power of the living word, and it is so because the men who wrote it firmly believed that the author of that word was the omniscient and infinite God. Take out of the Confession its biblical wheat, and scarcely a handful of straw remains.

Another significent proof that such was the conviction of the Reformers at Augsburg, is their repeated renunciation of the Anabaptists. Though this violent and anarchistic sect, which formed the extreme left of the Protestant army, did not reject God's written word, since they burnt all their books except the Bible, they nevertheless claimed an inner inspiration, which in their mind superseded that of the Scriptures. They placed their subjective spirituality above that of the Testaments. They judged the Bible by their own inner light. Their criterion was not the inspired word, but their own inspired souls. They were radical mystics. As will be seen at a glance, their position was the very opposite of the Lutherans. Hence in Article V. we find this vigorous rejection: "They condemn the Anabaptists and others, who suppose that the Holy Spirit is given to men by their own preparations and works, without the external word." Naturally there would have been a great temptation on the part of the reformers to retain these fanatical co-workers. They out-Luthered the Lutherans themselves in their opposition to Rome. They seemed to have the logic of the situation. But the conservative confessors could not countenance anyone who trifled with the canonical Scriptures. Hence by renouncing the Anabaptists, they placed themselves on record upon the written word of God as the only authority in religion, and as the only norm of spiritual experience. How could they do so, unless they had been persuaded that the book had been, in some way, authenticated from on high; that it bore the marks of divine composition?

We noticed that the last sentence of the Augsburg Confession calls the Bible "the divine and Holy Scriptures." This reverent expression is not solitary. All through the document the language applied to the book is adorable enough to be applied to

its ineffable Author himself. Now those men were not using the verbiage of medieval diplomacy to hide their meaning, but the plainest terms to express it. They were no word-jugglers. When they employed the term "divine," they did not wish to impart to it a flippant secondary sense. They did not mean to say, as the most inconoclastic higher critic might do, that the Bible is the finest specimen of literature in existence; but that it is a supernatural scroll of heavenly truth, a literary miracle, and not a wonder-work of mere human genius. No scholar or historian ever has interpreted this product of their hearts and brains otherwise. He who runs may read between the lines that they believed in the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures as a fact.

This position is greatly strengthened by the collateral evidence which can be collected from the other writings of Melanchthon and the books of Luther. It is well-known, and undisputed, that the former composed and the latter indorsed the Augsburg Confession. Luther more than metaphorically looked over his friend Philip's shoulder while he was writing the historic instrument. If therefore we can discover, elsewhere, their views on the Bible, we shall know what their views concerning it must be in the Augsburg Confession. There must be no contradictions, or their testimony shall have no value. Unless they agree on this point everywhere, they are authorities nowhere.

In his preface to the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, Melanchthon calls the Bible the "Scripture of the Holy Ghost." This is a remarkably strong expression, one which a man, who did not believe in inspiration, would not make. The most radical advocate of a diacritical theopneusty, who would claim that even the Hebrew vowel-points were inspired, could not be more emphatic.

An examination of the *Loci Theologici* reveals the same opinion. Though there is in that fountain of Lutheran theology no distinct chapter on inspiration, as all modern writers would have, nevertheless its position on the subject is plain. On page 43 of the Latin text, under the head "*De Spiritu Sancto*," Melanchthon declares: "Also in Zech. 7 : (12) it is said: 'The words which the Lord of hosts had sent by his Spirit by the hand of the

former prophets. By this saying it is furthermore on both sides affirmed, both that the prophets were guided by the Holy Spirit (gubernatos esse Spiritu Sancto), and that the word of God is no empty sound, but that the Holy Spirit is present in it, and by that voice moves and kindles minds."

Again on page 51, he begins a beautiful prayer to the Holy Spirit thus: "Holy Spirit, who wast poured out upon the apostles, whom the Son of God has promised to us." It thus becomes clear that the "Teacher of Germany" believed in the inspiration both of the Old and the New Testament. Luther says: "To sum up all, the Holy Bible is the most excellent and best book of God, full of comfort in all temptations; concerning faith, hope and love, it teaches very different things from those which reason can see and feel, comprehend and experience." (Hagenbach, Hist. Doc. II., p. 228.) Again he says: "Many foes, Egyptian, Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman, have raged against the Bible, endeavoring to exterpate it; but they have been able to accomplish nothing. They are all gone, but the Book remains forever perfect." ("Watchwords," from Luther, by Mrs. Charles, page 69.)

In another place he designates the Bible as "the Book given by God, the Holy Spirit, to his Church" (Köstlin, Theol. Luth., Vol. II., p. 223.) So also he calls the books of Moses "a writing of the Holy Spirit," and the Holy Spirit he calls *libri autor*, the "author of the book," (idem). Hence his great interpreter, Dr. Köstlin, after acknowledging that we cannot, from the writings of Luther, furnish any precise explanation as to the nature and form of inspiration, makes the following pertinent comment: "Very important materials, however, for the construction of a doctrine of inspiration in accordance with his peculiar view of the subject have been furnished by the foregoing review. Only upon the view of such an inspiration by the Holy Spirit as was peculiar to the Scriptures alone, in contradistinction from the productions of even the most pious and holy Christians of post-apostolic ages, could rest the lofty estimate which Luther entertained of the Bible." (idem, p. 251, Hay).

Add to this expert testimony that of Dr. Hagenbach, another

specialist, that "the Reformers humbly submitted their judgment to the authority of Scripture as a divine revelation," and we are ready to understand that Luther and Melanchthon could not have composed the Augsburg Confession, without letting their sentiments concerning its sure inspiration leak out. Unconsciously they taught the doctrine without even mentioning it. They could not have done otherwise, "for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh" Luke 6 : 45.

An examination of Luther's Introductions (Vorreden) to various books of the Bible, as well as several general introductions to the Scriptures as a whole, forming volume eleven of the Erlangen edition of 1854, did not furnish expected results. In these prefaces he is so taken up with the biblical contents themselves, that he apparently forgets to tell us whence they came. He is especially zealous in pointing out their evangelical elements. In his mind, as usual, everything must bend to the doctrine of justification by faith.

But on page 18 he shows his exalted view of God's law by declaring that it would be right, "if he were to command us to carry muck or to pick up straws." (Mist tragan oder Strohhalme autheben). On page 28, he says that the Psalms contain such a summary of the entire Scriptures that it seems to him as though in them "the Holy Spirit himself had wished to go to the trouble of collecting a short Bible." On page 169, he expresses doubt concerning the inspiration of the Apocalypse, saying: "Und allerdinge nicht spuren kann dass es von dem Heiligen Geist gestellet sei"—"and certainly I cannot see that it was arranged by the Holy Spirit." The legitimate inference is that he did consider this to be the case with other books.

Another incidental but real proof that the Lutheran fathers upheld the doctrine of biblical inspiration appears in the fact that they utterly rejected tradition as it was taught by the Romanists. These doctrines and customs which had been handed down from hoary antiquity, first orally and then by means of literature, were not despised as altogether useless. They were given a place and respectful consideration, but they

were strenuously denied parity with the Holy Scriptures. The charge was made against the Romanists that "they demand that their traditions be observed far more accurately than the gospel." (Chap. 14, Apol.) "Human traditions, instituted to propitate God, to merit grace and make satisfaction for sins, are opposed to the gospel and the doctrine of faith" (Art. XV.)

"These traditions," declares our Confession, "obscured the commandments of God, because traditions were preferred far above the commandments of God" (XXVI.) The Reformers positively denied inspiration to these traditions. In the Apology Melanchthon declares of them: "Neither are they the effects of the Holy Ghost" (Bk. Con., p. 158). In the Smalcald Articles, Luther says: "It is of no consequence that articles of faith are framed from the works or words of the holy Fathers. * * * We have, however, another rule, viz., that the word of God should frame articles of faith; otherwise no one, not even and angel" (Bk. Con., p. 315).

It is evident that such language can only mean that the Bible is authoritative, because it is inspired of the Holy Spirit, and that tradition is negligible with impunity, because it is simply the opinion of fallible men. Knowing the opposite view of the enemy, whom the Reformers were combatting, we can not honestly come to any other conclusion. From such a contrast a strong argument may legitimately be drawn. The Lutheran position is well stated in the Introduction to the Formula of Concord proper: "Other writings, of ancient or modern teachers, whatever reputation they may have, should not be regarded as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures, but should altogether be subordinated to them" (Bk. Con., p. 461). Why is this distinction made, but to show that one is considered the outflow of a divine, and the other of a human source? The difference between them must be just that.

To establish the point in question further research is unnecessary. Yet it will add strength to the argument if we add, as cumulative proof, the evidence of that theology, which has been the natural outcome of the original fountains which we have already examined. At the same time we will not fall victims to

the weakness of supposing that a long array of quotations can in the least establish a truth. Usually we can find as many so-called authorities on one side as on the other. But Paul interprets Christ; Augustine interprets Paul; Luther, both. Our minor symbols explain the major one. If we have a Lutheran system, it must be consistent. The fruit must agree with the tree. On account of these considerations, we will hear some of our greater theologians on this subject.

Baier gives us a comprehensive definition. He says: "Divine inspiration was that agency by which God supernaturally communicated to the intellect of those who wrote, not only the correct conception of all that was to be written, but also the conception of the words themselves and of everything by which they were to be expressed, and by which he also instigated their will to the act of writing" (Schmid, Dog., p. 57).

Gerhard strongly states the cause as follows: "The instrumental causes of Sacred Scripture were holy men of God, men peculiarly and immediately elected and called by God for the purpose of committing to writing the divine revelations; whom, therefore, we properly call the *amanuenses* of God, the hand of Christ, and the scribes or notaries of the Holy Spirit, since they neither spoke nor wrote by their own human will, but borne along by the Holy Spirit" (idem, p. 60).

Quenstedt thus expresses himself: "God, therefore, alone, if we wish to speak accurately, is to be called the author of the Sacred Scriptures; the prophets and apostles cannot be called the authors, except by a kind of catachresis" (idem, p. 60).

Hollazius distinguishes between inspiration and mere supervision: "For the latter merely guards against anything being written that is not true, becoming, congruous; whereas the former, through the Holy Spirit dictating, suggests the conceptions of the things to be written. The divine supervision would warrant the infallibility of the Sacred Scriptures, but not their inspiration" (idem, p. 61).

Quenstedt also notes another distinction, when he says: "We must distinguish between divine revelation when by it the subject-matter itself is made known, and when it refers to the pe-

culiar circumstances and time and manner and order in which the subject-matter is to be reduced to writing." Thus revelation and inspiration are not, strictly speaking, equivalents. "The former could precede the commitment to writing, the latter was always associated with it and flowed over into the writing itself" (idem, p. 67).

Martensen disposes of a mooted distinction as follows: "We must, accordingly, maintain not only the union of the divine and human in Scripture, but at the same time the distinction between these two. The old proposition, *the Scripture is the Word of God* expresses the union; the more modern dictum, *the Scriptures contain the Word of God*, expresses the distinction. The first proposition is clearly preferable to the second, which is vague and indistinct, and may be applied to many writings" (Ch. Dog., p. 403).

Once more we will hear Quenstedt: "There is a great diversity among the sacred writers in regard to style and mode of speaking which appears to arise from the fact that the Holy Spirit accommodated himself to the ordinary mode of speaking, leaving to each one his own manner; yet we do not thereby deny that the Holy Spirit suggested the particular words to these individuals" (Schmid, Dog., p. 65).

From these few specimens culled from the rich field of Lutheran theology, we learn that, though the question of inspiration did not become prominent in the Christian Church till after the Reformation, when it did come up, our leaders were not found wanting. Yet not one of the fathers, so far as appears, ever wrote a special book on the special subject, as so many of the Calvinistic doctors have done.

Calovius, who is credited with being the author of the modern orthodox theory of Protestantism,* declares: "No error, even in unimportant matters, no defect of memory, not to say untruth, can have any place in all the Sacred Scriptures" (Schmid, p. 67). Later teachers, like Tholuck, Dorner, as before them Luther himself, held a more liberal opinion. It is therefore not possible to name any particular theory as the only Lutheran

*Schaff-Herzog, p. 1103).

view. "Inspiration," says Luthardt: "was presupposed as self-evident, but without setting up a theory thereof." (Dog., p. 305).

We have already seen that our symbols simply insist upon the fact of inspiration, and rest the matter there. The Bible itself does no more. Yet it may justly be claimed that the general trend of our theology is toward the plenary hypothesis. But this idea is extended not to any recension, translation, or extant codex, but only to the long-lost autographic manuscripts.

It is easy to predict that we will, at least we may, soon see this subject become a live issue again. Perhaps it may agitate Christendom as it never has done before. This will be owing to the disturbances of the Higher Criticism as to the contents of the Bible. The Holy Book as literature is in the crucible. But even if it could be satisfactorily proven, from internal evidence, that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, but that it is the composite product of several authors, such as the Jehovist, Elohist, Priest, and Deuteronomist, who perhaps were mostly redactors themselves, why should not their editing have been inspired? Why should not a providential superintendence have been granted them, so that they should have eliminated all fiction or fable from the primitive sources, tablets, documents, or oral traditions and given us the real truth only? Thus the inspiration of the whole would insure the inspiration of the parts, just as now orthodoxy holds that the inspiration of the parts establishes that of the whole. If a divinely guided Ezra adjusted and reconstructed the Old Testament canon, it still is the Word of God. In E. A. Allen's "History of Civilization," written on the Darwinian basis, though accepting the results of the Higher Criticism, he says with reference to Creation: "It seems to us that one of the strongest arguments that the writer of Genesis was in some way assisted in his work by divine guidance, lies in the fact that he rejected so many details set forth in the Babylonian account" (Vol. I, p. 711). The compilation theory of biblical evolution is not necessarily destructive. One may at the same time be an honest literary critic of the Scriptures and yet remain a devout believer in their inspiration.

It is well known that the disciples of the Higher Criticism

profess great reverence for the Holy Book. We may safely give them credit for sincerity. Nevertheless we are more favorably impressed by the apparent inerrancy of the Bible, than by that of the literary ferrets who would be wiser than Moses. What Luther said, shortly before his death, of another kind of fault-finders, is very applicable to those of modern times: "Since then the Bible, which is the Holy Spirit's own special book, writing, and which (Geistes eingen, sonderlich Buch), must thus suffer from them, and be reviled as the mother and protectress of all heresy, why should not we suffer much more, in that they charge us with all heresy and sedition? A spider sucks poison out of the lovely rose, wherein a bee finds nothing but honey. What can she help, that her sweet honey becomes poison to the spider?" (Erl. Ed. Works, p. 415).

But whatever may happen, until we shall reach the higher realms of light the following resumé of Luthardt will remain the conviction of Lutheranism: "In the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, in which the revelation of salvation has deposited itself as in a complete and corresponding document of its own, the Church possesses that word of God which, over against ecclesiastical tradition and teaching, forms the determing norm, which is necessary to the Church for the fulfilling of her mission in the world, (namely) to bear witness to the truth of salvation in word and deed—an acknowledgment of the supreme authority of the Scriptures, in which in doctrine the Church indeed never failed (welcher der Kirche zwar in der Lehre nie fehlte), but which first came into full recognition and practical value at the Reformation. On the ground of that necessity and signification of the Scriptures the Church also is certain that the origin of the same is to be ascribed to a special operation of the Spirit of Revelation (inspiration) which employed the faculties of the writers, as the object both of the individual book and of Scripture as a whole demanded" (Comp. Dog., p. 299).

The Polychrome Bible cannot obscure the rain-bow of the covenant. As Luther declares in his Larger Catechism: "No man has spun the Ten Commandments, the Creed and the

Lord's Prayer out of his head, but they are revealed and given by God himself" (Bk. Con., p. 466).

It is therefore plain that our great Church can lift up her head anywhere among believers in the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. She has always been loyal in the past. She will not fail in the future. Though unbelief should succeed in demolishing all structural theories and hypotheses, our Church will extricate herself from the ruins, and again take her stand, without any theory, upon the adamantine rock of the fact of inspiration. To her, though all besides may be shattered, truth and Christ forever remain, untouched by the destructive criticisms of men.

ARTICLE VIII.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

By Prof. David H. Bauslin, D. D.

Canon Newbolt in his deeply spiritual book, entitled, "Speculum Sacredotum," says, that "it is almost startling to think of the immense number of sermons which are poured forth week by week from the pulpits of the land." The volume of this homiletic work is a tribute to the religious thoughtfulness of English-speaking people. A glance at the table of contents likewise of such a magazine as Salmond's "Critical Review," gives some indication of the immense importance attached by large classes of the same people to theological discussion, much of it of a high and somewhat abstruse order. The quarterly visits of this journal gives no countenance to the widely current slander on the "Queen of the Sciences," that people are no longer interested in theological dissertations. Here one always finds a big array of books, upon the greatest of all themes, and many of them of such a grasp upon the subject discussed and of such literary form, as to make them of permanent value. For exam-

ple, in the October number, we find in the large list such books as Newbolt's finely written and thoughtful book on "Religion," somewhat Anglican in its partisanship, but marked by a sweet spirit: Campbell's Gifford lectures on "Religion in Greek Literature," something out of the line yet given in that fine series of books, in which the author indicates the "man's steps in the ascent from Homer's childish fancies to the colossal heights of Plato's contemplations": "The trial of Jesus Christ: a legal monograph," by A. Taylor Innes, a deeply interesting study that supplies a real want in English literature, and which the *Review* earnestly commends "for its carefulness and power, and for its commanding interest;" Principal Simon's Reconciliation by Incarnation, a mature and elaborate discusssion at the hands of a capable specialist who has devoted long study and enthusiasm to the discussion of a great theme. Of him the *Review* says: "He is a follower, in an exclusive sense, of no man, but by this fresh example of patient and vigorous thinking has approved himself a master in this department and given us a volume which must be pronounced an important contribution to British Theology;" and the "works of Dionysius the Areopagite," now first translated by the Rev. John Parker, M. A. Of this work the *Reviewer* says:

"Dionysius, notwithstanding Vaughan's half-humorous depreciation of him, was a profound and subtle thinker. His works mark the complete interfusion of ecclesiastical Christianity with Oriental mysticism. And his doctrine exerted a powerful influence upon the religious thought of England, from the twelfth century to the sixteenth."

The *English Church Quarterly Review* for October contains three articles of special interest in current religious discussion. These articles involve the important doctrines of the Church and the Scriptures, and are constituted by three reviews of as many books by leading specialists in their respective departments of study and scholarship. (1.) The first of these is a study of the "Roman Primacy," by the Rev. Luke Rivington, D. D., who for his literary services was recompensed by Pope

Leo XIII., with the degree of Doctor of Divinity. The *Review* at the very beginning of its article sagaciously calls attention to the ambiquity involved in the very title of Dr. Rivington's treatise, and raises thereby a very important and interesting question in the history of the papacy.

"What is meant by 'the Roman Primacy?' The term is notoriously elastic, therefore indefinite, therefore misleading. An arguer does not promote, but rather hinders, a just perception of issues involved, if he summarizes his thesis in a word which opponents may use in diverse senses—one may say, in this case, which suits his opponents' thesis considerably better than his own. Dr. Rivington shows repeatedly in this book that he is well aware—indeed, he could not possibly be unaware—of the fact that Anglicans acknowledge *a* 'primacy' in St. Peter, and *a* 'primacy' in the Roman See of primitive times. But the point to be emphasized is that, while there are primacies and primacies, while a 'princeps senatus' has a secular 'primacy' in one sense, and a Diocletian in another, while Athens of old had by right a 'hegemony,' but was resisted when she asserted a 'dominion,' the polity which a Roman writer pleads for, as *jure divino* essential to Church life, is a primacy of a dominant and practically absolute kind. Why, then, should he not frankly entitle his book 'The Papal Monarchy in 430–451?'"

(2.) The second of these articles, which we have read with peculiar interest is a lengthy review of Prof. Briggs' "Introduction to the study of Holy Scripture." It is an elaborate and searching piece of work. It is sharp, candid and scholarly, and to our way of thinking, leaves but little of the hypothetical assumptions of the distinguished Union Seminary Professor. We regret that lack of space forbids us to give citations at length from the gratifying exhibit made in this paper. Speaking of the method of the critics the *Review* says: "They start from certain premises, in many respects hypothetical and imaginary, and deduce from them certain conclusions more or less in accord therewith, but which certainly do not follow from the premises assumed even if true, and which are

worth nothing if those premises are false. It becomes wearisome after a time to find one man after another playing the game of 'follow my leader,' and repeating assertions which they all find it convenient to forget, have never been, and cannot be, verified." "Assumption in proof of hypothesis and hypothesis as the basis of assumption, is the character of much that passes under the imposing and majestic name of Higher Criticism."

"The Higher Critics arrogate to themselves the exclusive possession of scholarship, and talk loudly about the 'best scholarship,' the great majority of modern scholars, and the like, as though there were nothing to be said on the other side, and as if nothing had been said on a matter by no means one of pure scholarship by Robertson, Blomfield, Baxter, Kennedy, Care, Spencer, Stanley Leattus, Lias and others, much of which we are bold to say, not only has not been answered, but which never can be answered."

"There is so much juggling in this matter. Dr. Briggs is very careful to lay it down as one of the many laws of thought, governing alike Higher Criticism and other things, that everything is either A, or not A; everything is either a given thing or something which is not a given thing; there is no mean between two contradictory propositions. Then if this is so, that which we have is a revelation, or it is not a revelation; if it is not a revelation, then away with it; no expulsion of the unclean thing can be too violent; but if we have a revelation then by all the laws of reason and science it must fulfill certain conditions, it must present certain credentials,—if, that is, we are to judge of it."

In this article we have found one of the keenest analysis of the hypothetical position of the critics to be found anywhere in the current discussion of the important questions at issue.

(3.) The third article referred to in the *Review*, has to deal also with an up-to-date question that has to do particularly with the validity of the Old Testament writings. It is a review and *resumé* of a series of essays recently published upon the general subject of "Authority and Archaeology." Prof. A. H. Sayce is probably the best authority cited in this book. The

editor sums up the results as archæological investigations as follows:

"We are bound to ask ourselves whether we feel that the Old and New Testaments have suffered any damage by the tests to which they have been put by the essayists. Our line of argument hitherto has been (1) that, on the whole, archæology is confirmatory, not subversive, of the traditional position; (2) that archæolgy is intended to be supplementary to and illustrative of history; (3) that our authorities are to be trusted unless they can be proved to be wrong; and (4) that the discoveries of archæology are not necessarily to be regarded as infallible, both because of a certain 'subjectivity' underlying some of them, and because we have evidence of 'restorations' at certain periods, which make us suspicious of hasty conclusions."

"We have no cause to be disappointed at the results of archæological research. We believe that, on the whole, the traditional view of the Bible has gained by being tested with the new evidence, and we think that another twenty years of patient research and study will confirm its position, much in the same way as Schliemann's views twenty years since upon prehistoric Greece, after being ridiculed, have been amply justified."

The leading article in the October number of the *American Journal of Theology* we should say is that of Prof. William Rupp, D. D., on "Ethical Postulates in Theology." Dr. Rupp very clearly has some of the expressions of the Latin theology in view in some things that he affirms, with no small degree of candor, and with a strong grasp on his subject, as for example: "Dogmatic Theology especially affords illustrations between theological definition and ethical principles, of which we are now speaking. Such antagonisms appeared especially in the doctrine of sin, and in the doctrine of soteriology. Here the ethical character which dogmatics itself, in its doctrine of God, attributes to him, is often utterly forgotten, and he is represented as violating the commonest ethical principles in his dealings with men. For instance, outside of theology, it is a universally recognized principle that personal freedom and responsibility are correlative."

"But now this fundamental principle of justice has been violated by a whole series of dogmatic definitions, about some of which a fierce battle is still raging." It is violated, for instance, by the doctrine of absolute predestination, according to which the eternal weal or woe of men is determined, not by their own freedom, but by the absolute and causeless pleasure of the creator."

We are disposed to think that there would be considerable dissent from the judgment expressed in the conclusion of Dr. Rupp's article: "The present widespread disaffection of the masses toward the Church we verily believe, has not its cause so much in the native depravity of the human heart, or in the prevailing influence of infidel science which denies the supernatural, as in the unethical form in which the gospel has been so generally presented. And this unethical presentation of the gospel, we hold, has not been true to Christ and the New Testament, and was therefore, *bound to fail.*"

One of the most interesting and profitable articles in the latest issue of the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* is that of Professor James Lindsay, on "Mysticism True and False." The article is a plea for a true mysticism in an age prone to go after things that can be seen and handled only. Prof. Lindsay says sincerely and truly:

"We should clear our minds of cant in such matters—cant which is no less cant because it is common. If the past excrescences of mystical tendency were greater than they are, that would not justify our giving way to the superficiality which sees not the central core to be preserved in all true mysticism. Our fears of religious rapture are quite superfluous: the hand of the world is too surely upon our wrist. It was reserved for our saintly fathers to ask God to withhold his hand lest the human vessel should burst. No, all the mysticism we shall be able to muster will barely suffice to keep our souls in health in this naturalistic time, wherein rationalism and formalism are never far to seek. Does it need to be said that an accession of interior force is the crying need of such spiritual life as remains to us? This is not to exclude thought from a single province—even that of feeling—

but it is to remind the proud omnipotence of thought that the heights of heavenly vision are open to it only as it is wedded to the spiritual insight of a pure and loving heart."

The leading article in the October number of the "*Bibliotheca Sacra*" is that of that valient, conservative scholar, the late Dr. Samuel C. Bartlett, entitled "Rupprecht on the Pentateuch." He has presented a fine summary for English readers of a thoroughly conservative and able work on tne Pentateuch, which as coming from Germany he declares to be a "noteworthy phenomenon," Dr. B. thinks that there are two reasons why the work of Rupprecht is to be viewed with special interest:

First, as the token of a strong conservative movement in Germany. It is intensely evangelical in its spirit, exalting in the strongest form the authority of both the Old and New Testaments. No volume published recently on either side of the Atlantic excels it in this respect. And it is not alone. To the same purport is George Stosch's book, "The Origin of Genesis" (1897), written, as he says in his preface, "to prove that there still exists in Germany a school of theology bound in obedience to the word of God," and "as a defense against the destructive criticisms of a disintergrating science." Less scholarly in method, it is a reverential and popular exhibition of the "external and internal coherence of" the book of Genesis as designed to "comprise the record of a wondrous history." It was somewhat longer ago (1890) that Dr. Adolph Zahn published his defense of Deuteronomy "against the disorderly procedure (*Unwesen*) of modern criticism,"—a method, he avers, unknown in secular historical investigation, and permitted only in the territory of the Scriptures; one which makes of the Pentateuch especially "a heap of ruins that harmonizes well with the desolation of the Church which surrounds us on every hand." In 1894 he published his "Sober View of Modern Criticism," which brought him such a return of appreciation and encouragement as proved that there still is a Church which holds fast the truths of the Bible. In 1893 Hermann Billieb issued his defense of the Pentateuch, founded on the evidence of the old prophets

Hosea and Amos (like the volume of Professor Robertson, 1892,) in which he shows that "a divine providence has taken care that these historical prophets, standing on the outpost of the kingdom of the ten tribes, should become incontrovertible witnesses, and abundant in their testimony." These bold utterances of German pastors, are put forth in the very presence of all the learned ingenuity.

The *New World* may be said fairly to represent the most advanced type of liberal thinking on religious topics, especially that widely current in New England. The last issue contains an unusually able and interesting table of contents, from which we may note of special interest, "Jesus' Foreknowledge of His Sufferings and Death," by Otto Pfleiderer; the "Genesis of Faith," by Albert Gehring; and the "Scientific and Christian View of Illness," by James T. Bixley.

The *Contemporary Review* contains an excellent article by Professor Sabatier, on a theme about which much that is wise and much otherwise, has been written in recent times. He discusses a live theological question in the article entitled, "Christian Dogma and the Christian Life." The writer is clearly of the opinion that men have not lost interest in theology. He says: "The labors and progress of scientific theology, in our time, are neither less rich nor less worthy of admiration than those accomplished in our day, by all the other sciences." The last question discussed by Mr. Sabatier is this: "What shall be our attitude as regards the formularies and the dogmatic symbols in use among different churches." "Our attitude" says he, "cannot be either a blind reaction or a violent rupture; it can neither be an adhesion without criticism, nor a revolt without piety. How can we with a good conscience break with the traditions of the first centuries, or with the protestant tradition of modern centuries, when we have the conviction that we are their legitimate children, and the desire to reap and cultivate their inheritance?" "The more I advance the more I feel attached to the tradition of my fathers by all the very roots of my life and

in thinking of my old Reformed Church of France, of its liturgy, of the old confession of faith, of its psalms and canticles, I feel I can cry aloud with the old Hebrew poet, exiled on the banks of the Euphrates: 'Jerusalem, if I forget thee, may my right hand forget itself.' And this is no easy sceptical adaptation, a sort of disdainful or hypocritical diplomatic arrangement; it is rather the love and gratitude of a child. Ingathering with reverence all the moral riches of this family tradition, my most ardent desire would be to prolong it and to make it yet more fruitful."

"To confirm us in this method and in this course of conduct, we have the example even of Jesus Christ. We know what was his attitude in reference to the law of Moses and the tradition of his people. No Israelite was ever attached to them with a more sincere heart or deeper piety. Far from breaking with the part. He desired that his gospel should be to all, a continuation and a crowning work. No doubt the new matter which he brought disagreed with certain rabinnical traditions, or modified them by broadening out certain prescriptions of the law; but on the other hand, his teaching set forth the deeper spirit, the religious and moral ideal of the sacred code and of the old prophecies, and he could in all truth declare that he came not to destroy but to fulfill the law and the prophets. Such is the way in which we, too, attach ourselves positively to the dogmatic traditions of the Church."

II.

GERMAN.

By Rev. S. Gring Hefelbower, A. M.

For some time back scientific investigation of the life of Christ begins with the promise that the founder of Christian religion, in spite of his peculiar personality and his meaning for the world's history, belonged to his own time and race, and consequently busies itself with determining how much the thought and life of Jesus were influenced, not merely as to form but also as to content, by the Jewish expectation of the Messiah, or to

what extent they transcended Judiaism. However, some of the most recent writers on this theme have refused to follow this new way of treating the subject, and have used the former methods. Starting out from opposition to the Church's doctrine of the Trinity, and attempting to prove that Christ was a true man, they strive by this new method to set the genuinely human elements in the opinions and sayings of Jesus in their true light. This emphasis of the human side causes the special historical solving of the life-picture and preaching of Jesus to disappear, and puts in its place a more or less pronounced modernization of the same. Hollenberg's pamphlet on "The Religion of Jesus Christ" belongs to this catagory, which is characterized by a dogmatic gleaming of information which touches religious history, and not by exact historic investigation. He concludes that faith in God the Father was the central life-giving truth that Christ preached. Jesus understood by "the kingdom of God" not only the moral world, but God's immanence in the world—the unity of God and world. The "kingdom of God" and the "kingdom of the world are essentially the same."—Just the very opposite of Jesus' teaching. It is a picture of Jesus in the sense of enlightenment according to the plan of Lessing. Jesus is "the classic religious genius of humanity that transcends all else," the preacher of "ethical humanism."

To give a brief presentation of the synoptic question as it stands to-day in Germany, would probably cause a German professor to hestitate. That which is attemped here is merely a digest of certain reviews of recent literature on the subject (particularly Zahn's "Introduction to the New Testament") which have appeared in the *Theologisches Literaturzeitung*, *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, *Allgemeine Evangelische Luterische Kirchenzeitung*, *Theologische Rundschau*, and an article in the sixth volume of Mensel's *Kirchliches Handlexicon* which came out during the year.

Stated in few words the question is this: In reading the first three gospels we are impressed by their striking similarities and dissimilarities; what do they mean and whence are they? From

the very first, students of the New Testament have tried to an-answer this question, and now Johannes Weiss of Marburg informs us that we are "farther than ever from agreeing even in the most important fundamental things"—a rather extreme statement as many of Johannes Weiss' declarations are. Some have attempted an answer by assuming that each evangelist used the gospels which he found already written, and that our present arrangement is chronological (Augustin, Hugo Grotius, Wettstein and Bengel. Beza placed Luke first). Then the answer was sought by assigning one or several common sources. A number of rationalists accepted this theory (Lessing and Semler). Eichhorn postulated a Syro-Chaldean gospel from which the synoptics come. Others thought they would answer it by conceiving of these gospels as springing from a fixed Aramaic type of tradition. (Sartorius and recently Wetzel and Veit). About 1830 De Wette and Sieffert concluded that the passage from Papias quoted by Eusebius in his Church History, which speaks of Matthew as having written "the words" of Jesus, did not fit Matthew as we have it, but some primitive gospel written by the apostle in Hebrew or Aramaic and lost. About this time the priority of Mark was advanced and the most natural conclusion that could be drawn was that Mark and the "logia" of Matthew were used by the writers of the first three gospels.

This gives us the hypothesis of two common sources as an answer to the question, which in more or less divergent forms is now more widely accepted than any other theory. Its chief support is found in the fact that by excluding from the first and third gospels the didactic elements common to both, we have left a series of narrations that are practically the same as the second gospel which, it is claimed, proves that the writers of the first and third gospels used the second as a sort of frame-work into which they put didactic elements from some other source—in all probability the logia of Matthew. This theory numbers among its advocates, Holtzmann, Harnack, Schuerer, Johannes Weiss, Juelicher and the venerable Bernhard Weiss of Berlin, who probably excels all others in his thorough mastery of the

subject. He teaches that there were two written sources, canonical Mark, or a work almost identical with it, which contained chiefly narratives of the life and work of Christ, and the logia of Matthew, which contained his sayings with a comparatively small proportion of the narrative element. The authors of Matthew and Luke knew and used both these sources, but neither writer knew or used the other's work, (vide his introduction to N. T., 3rd edition 1897 and commentaries on Mark and Matthew, 1872 and 1876). He teaches that the small narrative element in the logia was used by Mark, and therefore that by studying Mark and the passages common to both Matthew and Luke we can approach the character of this primitive source. This has been attempted in English by Blair, and in German by a Thuringian pastor, A. Resch, who made his life-work the reconstruction of the primitive gospel that lies back of our synoptic gospels—a real gospel with narrative parts and addresses which is intended to be none other than the logia written by Matthew to which Papias referred. In doing this he uses not only our gospels but also extra-canonical parallel texts. The Greek text that he thus gets is often quite different from that of our gospels. G. Dalman has also begun the publication of a work of a somewhat similar character, "The Words of Jesus." It promises to be of use, because of the Rabbinical light it claims to throw on certain cardinal expressions that Jesus used in speaking of himself and man, such as "Son of man," "Kingdom of God," "Kingdom of Heaven," etc.

A recent book by Hadorn on the genesis of Mark ignores entirely the theory of two sources and claims that our second gospel was constructed from Matthew's logia, and that which Mark remembered from Peter's narration. (This second source is recognized by almost all N. T. students).

Zahn in Vol. II. of his N. T. Introduction, though he treats the gospels at considerable length, devotes a comparatively small space to their interrelation, *i. e.*, to the synoptic question proper, for which many condemn him. He lays down as a fundamental principle that the individual peculiarities of each gospel must be known and mastered before we are in a position

to consider the question at all, and consequently devotes the greater part of his energy and space to a thorough analysis of the several gospels. The course of his investigation is this: First of all the tradition concerning the gospel is given, and then its text and contents are analyzed to see whether they agree with and confirm tradition. This method has called forth much severe criticism from his opponents, among whom are Schuerer and Johannes Weiss. They claim that he is prejudiced in favor of tradition and is consequently unfair in his analysis often forcing a text till he gets from it that which he wants. But Steinmetz remarks concerning these criticisms that these traditions are so old and approach so near to the time of the writing of the gospels that no investigator can ignore them. Zahn, Vol. II., p. 193, writes: "As touching tradition, the keenest critics with few unsatisfactory exceptions have shown so much historical sense that they sought supports for their hypotheses in the oldest reports concerning the origin of the gospels, but generally with an arbitrary choice." In paragraph 49 he gives the tradition for all three gospels and then devotes a special paragraph to the tradition for each individual gospel. Mark is treated before Matthew, propably because this gospel antedates Matthew in Greek.

Zahn is of the opinion that a certain guiding purpose was present in the mind of each gospel writer which furnishes the reason why the material is arranged as it is and not otherwise. The purpose of Mark is found in the first verse, which is not intended to apply to one particular chapter but to the entire book. The beginning of the gospel was the preaching of Christ, not that of John the Baptist which is accordingly briefly mentioned. The purpose of Matthew is also announced in the first verse. "It is an historic defense of the Nazarene and his followers over against Judaism." Luke was written to give the history of Christianity up to a certain point in such a way that a cultured heathen (Theophilus) would get an impression of the reliability of Christian traditions.

Matthew wrote his gospel in Hebrew or Aramaic, while Paul and Peter were preaching in Rome, or about 62. The reference

to it by Papias as "the words" or "the sayings" merely describes its chief characteristic. The original is lost, Our Matthew is a Greek translation made by some unknown person about the year 85, who had before him Mark's gospel, which influenced his choice of words and expressions.

Mark is really the first gospel written that we have in its original form. The difference between the account by Irenaeus and that of Clemens Alexandrinus, one placing it before and the other after the death of Peter, is explained by assuming that Mark begun his gospel during Peter's life and did not complete it, or at least did not publish it, till after his martyrdom. Mark gives us accounts of things heard from Peter, certain events that he himself witnessed (the scene in the garden) and some facts gathered from other sources, among which was Matthew's gospel in the original.

The book closes with the eighth verse of the sixteenth chapter. Luke wrote the third gospel abont 75 and used Mark, but it is not likely that he used Matthew. That which our first and third gospels have in common, not found in the record, is best explained by assuming that they got it from oral tradition. An examination of the text of Matthew gives us no reason at all for concluding that he used written sources.

It will be seen from this that Zahn's position is different from any other held at the present time and flatly contradicts the popular theory of two sources. In several important respects it is a return to the first answer ever given to the synoptic problem.

Recently the literature on the historical books of the Old Testament, which is small as compared with that which treats of the other divisions of the Old Testament, received the addition of Budde's Commentary on Judges, Benzinger's Commentary on Kings and a third edition of Thenius' work on Samuel by Toehr, so competely revised as almost to pass for a new work. The first and second of these books are representative of a rather extreme type of Old Testament criticism. They show the extent to which men dare to go in distinguishing sources and revisions. Budde's conclusions as to sources are as follows: the older

source was Judaistic and is the same as Judges of the former Old Testament books. It contains in connection with the account of entrance the stories Jehud, Jabin, Gideon, Abimelech, Jephthah, Samson, the wandering of the Danites and the history of Gibeah. The later or theocratic source originated in northern Israel (E) and contains the accounts of Jehud, Deborah and Barak, Gideon, Abimelech, Jephthah and the wandering of the Danites, but instead of the story of Samson it has that of Samuel as the conqueror of the Philistines. Both were united into one writing by a redactor probably after 650 B. C., and then the result was worked over in the interests of the Deuteronomic school, of which editing or revising there are traces, particularly in 2 : 6–3 : 6. Then there was a renewed Deuteronomic redaction. And finally about 400 B. C. it was edited again in the interests of the priesthood.

Benzinger in his commentary on Kings concludes that 1 and 2 Kings are made up from two very different sources. The one contained short notes on annals brought together without any reflection. The other was made up of a number of detailed narratives, some of which were popular and others devotional in style and are of very different historical value. With the exception of the account of the temple they are all biographical sketches. The account of Solomon must have been edited before the compiler touched it. Benzinger then attempts to show that there were really two redactors—the latter of whom put the book in such a condition that we can speak of a real plan. Knenen disaggrees with this. Toehr, in his re-edited commentary of Thenius on 1 and 2 Samuel, rejects all thories as to different sources and redactions and concludes that the entire work came from one author. As might be expected his book has been severely criticized. Kautzsth may be taken as representative of those who differ. He teaches that there were three different writers at work on the book at as many different times.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Lutheran Cyclopedia. Edited by Henry Eyster Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., Dean of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa, and Rev. John A. W. Haas, B. D. With the co-operation of Professor O. Zoeckler, University of Greifswald, and other European Scholars and Representative Scholars from the various synods.

At the meeting of the General Synod at Harrisburg, Pa., in 1885, the Board of the Lutheran Publication Society was "recommended to secure at the earliest practical time the preparation and publication of a cyclopedia of Lutheranism." For reasons not made public, that recommendation was not carried into effect. The late Christian Literature Company took the initiative in the preparation of the present volume, and the result of compliance with its urgent request, is "a summary of the chief topics comprised in the doctrine, the life, the customs, the history, and the statistics of the Lutheran Church " That one of the desiderata of the Lutheran Church has been met in the publication of this volume, and that it will be "of immense service to all our departments of labor," is gratefully conceded. That the preparation of articles by contributors was a labor of love, is evidenced by the fact that, November 1st 1900, they are to receive one dollar per page for their contributions.

"The book is a library condensed, containing information that cannot be gathered elsewhere with shelves full of authorities." Many of the articles have been written by specialists, and out of the fulness of empirical knowledge. Noteworthy features are sketches of men and institutions of learning, of synods and churches, statistics, Luther's Ninety-five Theses, Claus Harms' Ninety-five Theses, Lutheran Chronology. As a rule a just balance has been struck between too much and too little, though some subjects have been expanded out of proportion to their importance for American Lutherans. Why should more than three columns be given to Rev. William Loehe, and, upon an average, less than half so much space be allotted to Muhlenberg, Schmucker, Krauth and Mann? Why should Swedenborg have nearly a column, and Franz Delitzsch only half a column? Indeed, what claim has Swedenborg to a place in a Lutheran cyclopedia? Why should the Luther League, which is too young to have a history, be given nearly three columns, and the Evangelical Alliance be put off with half a column? If the latter merits a place in this book, it merits fuller treatment. And why was not the name of Dr. S. S. Schmucker, who in London in 1840

was called "the father of the Alliance," mentioned in this article? And why should some eight or ten columns be given to German and Scandinavian Homiletical Literature, which can be of but little use to American readers, and the English Sermons of only Seiss, Loy and Kuegele be mentioned? Why were Stork, Miller, Rhodes and Valentine, of the General Synod, everlooked? The editors ought to have supplemented the partial list offered by Mr. Hoffmann.

We are especially pleased with the articles on persons, places and countries of Germany. The information conveyed by these articles is just what we so often need. Many of such articles have been furnished by Dr. Spaeth. They could not have emanated from a more intelligent source. Dr. Spaeth has seen, and by observation and experience has known, much that he describes. Very learnedly and lovingly has he written of "*Wuertemberg, Luth. Church in.*" He who reads this article will not thereafter sniffle at "the Lutheran Church in Wuertemberg at present numbering about 1,500,000 souls, with 1000 pastors, under six general superintendents, and 49 superintendents," p. 553.

The chief articles setting forth the doctrine, cultus, polity and *Symbolik* of the Lutheran Church are the following:

Administration of the Sacrament,	Dr. Horn.
Agenda, Consensus of,	Dr. Horn.
Altar-Fellowship,	Drs. Fritschel and Valentine.
Apology of the Augsburg Confession,	Mr Haas.
Augsburg Confession,	Dr. Zoeckler.
Baptism,	Dr. Weidner.
Catechisms,	Dr. Spaeth.
Catechisation,	Dr. Spaeth.
Christology,	Mr. Haas.
Church,	Dr. Jacobs.
Church Polity,	Dr. Jacobs.
Common Service,	Dr. Horn.
Confession and Absolution,	Dr. Jacobs.
Dogmatics,	Drs. Weidner and Jacobs.
Ethics,	Mr. Haas.
Form of Concord,	Dr. Jacobs.
Freedom of the Will,	Mr. Haas.
Fundam ntals,	Dr. Jacobs.
Gospel,	Dr. Jacobs.
Grace,	Dr. Weidner.
Hymnody,	Dr. Spaeth.
Justification,	Drs. Gerberding and Jacobs.
Kirchenordnung,	Dr. Spaeth.
Liturgy.	Dr. Horn.
Lord's Supper,	Dr. Jacobs.
Ministry,	Mr Haas.

Ordination, ... Dr. Horn.
Power of the Keys, ... Dr. Jacobs.
Predestination, . . Prof. Graebner, Drs. Fritschel and Jacobs.
Sacraments, ... Dr. Jacobs.
Symbolics, ... Dr. Jacobs.
Sunday, ... Dr. Jacobs.
Word of God, ... Dr. Jacobs.

It will thus be seen that nearly all the *distinguishing* doctrinal and confessional articles were written by four or five General Council theologians, the name of the Senior Editor appearing fifteen times, and that of the Junior Editor, four times, in the list of articles given above. That is, a few General Council theologians are the authors of nearly all the *distinctive* doctrinal teaching in this volume. The teaching is characteristically that of the Form of Concord, and of the seventeenth century dogmaticians. The influence of the dogmatic coryphaei of the nineteenth century,—von Hofmann, Kahnis, Frank, Luthardt, *et al.*,—is scarcely, if at all, perceptible. And yet these men, with a love of truth, and a fidelity to conviction, equal to that of the dogmaticians; with a more varied culture, and with a superior philosophical, biblical and literary apparatus, have developed the doctrinal teaching of the Lutheran Church and made it fuller, richer, more scriptural and practical, than it became in the hands of the men of two hundred and fifty and three hundred years ago. Indeed, they were greater theologians than the old dogmaticians, on the principle that a pigmy standing on the shoulders of a giant can see further than a giant; though they were by no means pigmies. They were the Lutheran giants of the nineteenth century. But of their teaching our authors seem to be well-nigh oblivious. Reading their articles one gets the impression that the stream of Lutheran doctrine emanating from Wittenberg, after meandering over Germany for a century and a half, had, like the Gaudalquiver, suddenly disappeared, and then two hundred years later had sprung up in divers places in America.

But what of the fact that no name of a General Synod professor of didactic theology appears in connection with any distinctive Lutheran article?—if we except "Altar-Fellowship," which is not strictly doctrinal. This may have been accidental, but it is a fact nevertheless. The "representative scholars" from other synods are not quite so conspicuous by the absence of their names from this class of articles.

All the leading articles connected with liturgy and cultus are from the pens of two General Council theologians, Drs. Horn and Spaeth. Not for one moment would we impeach the liturgical learning of these worthy Christian gentlemen. But they are understood to be disciples of the Romanizing Kliefoth and Loehe, and to entertain certain very extreme notions on some points connected with worship, notions which, to use the language of the very distinguished von Zezschwitz, not a few

Lutherans in this country, and nearly all Lutheran liturgical scholars in Germany, regard as more or less *cultus-idealizing*, *Puseyizing*, *Romanizing*.

We cannot but wonder why the names of Dr. Schuette and Rev. Frederick Lochner,—quite the peers of any Lutheran liturgiologists in this country,—do not appear in connection with this class of articles.

It thus appears that a very disproportionately large part of the *educative* articles in this volume,—those which determine the character of its doctrinal and liturgical teaching,—come from the pens of about half a dozen "representative scholars" of the General Council. In other words, in this volume the General Council so far becomes the teacher of the American Lutheran Church in doctrine and cultus, that already we have heard the book called "*The General Council Cyclopedia*;" and yet from the very nature of the case General Synod ministers and laymen are expected to be very frequent purchasers of this book. How they will take it that so few of *their* "representative scholars" participate in the *educative* features of this book, remains to be seen. General Synod men, however, have an honorable place among the writers of history, biography and colorless subjects.

We now give attention to some points in detail:

1. On p. 3, Dr. Horn treats of *Agenda, Consensus of*. Nothing could better demonstrate the *dissensus* of the Lutheran Agenda than Dr. Horn's diagram and the accompanying explanation. Hence we must enter our respectful but decided *non libet* against this article. We have read some thousands of pages on the Lutheran Agenda, written by the most eminent German liturgiologists; but not once have we found the equivalent of *Consensus of Agenda*. On the contrary we have again and again met with affirmations and demonstrations of the greatest variety of the Lutheran Agenda. In the preface to this very volume the Senior Editor declares that "there was the greatest diversity" in liturgy in the Lutheran Church. And when on pp. 123-4 Dr. Horn in various ways speaks of the Common Service as the common consent, etc., we must say: *Quod non demonstratum est*. Just ten years ago (January, 1890) in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, we alleged that, part for part, form for form, word for word, the Common Service is almost identical with Loehe's Liturgy of 1883–4; and that in fulness and elaborateness, in the number of so-called "enrichments," the Common Service transcends any Lutheran liturgy of the sixteenth century. We ask Dr. Horn to exhibit a Lutheran Liturgy of the sixteenth century that is so full, so elaborate, as the Common Service. So long as men ring the changes on the "common consent," we have a right to ask such a favor, and to point to our published exhibitions in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for 1890, pp. 182–3, 493, 498. For with us it has not been a question of liturgy or no liturgy; much less, opposition to *Lutheran* liturgy, but a question of *fact*.

2. The article on the Augsburg Confession, pp. 29 *et seqq.*, is from the pen of Dr. Zoeckler. In the treatment of the Schwabach Articles "which Luther himself had edited ; ' of the Torgau Articles, "the majority of which clearly bear the impress of Melanchthon's authorship" ; of the one and only sending to Luther, May 11th, and Luther's approval, May 15th ; of the relation of the Schwabach Articles to the first seventeen articles of the Confession, and of the Torgau Articles to the second part,—of these and other important points Dr. Zoeckler writes in essential harmony with the treatment of the same points in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for July, 1897, July, 1898, October, 1899

But he has committed some palpable inaccuracies: Not "at the beginning of March" [1530] but March 14th "the Elector asked for a detailed apology of the evangelical standpoint." Not "five days after the Emperor's entrance into Augsburg," but nine days after, Friday, June 24th "the evangelical princes obtained not without great difficulty, the imperial permission for public reading of their Confession." (See this No. of the QUARTERLY, pp. 43, 51). The Confession was *not* "almost completed" when sent to Luther, May 11th. (LUTH. QUARTERLY, Oct., 1899, p. 521 and *note*).

On p. 31, Dr. Zoeckler, writing of the *Editio Variata* of 1540, says: "But not a few of these Locupletionen effected rather the introduction of the synergistic mode of teaching into the doctrinal unity of the Confession, a mode which had for some time been preferred by Melanchthon, approaching the Catholic point of view. Even more reprehensible than this attempt at innovation in a Romanizing sense, was the change which he made the 10th art. 'de coena domini,' suffer." This is simply a rehash of the calumniations of 300 years ago, and reveals the lack of scholarly investigation on the part of the writer. Dr Jacobs, who, we know, has make thorough investigation on this point, writes, p. 289: "The changes make by Melanchthon in the so-called *Variata* or 'altered' Augsburg Confession of 1540 occasioned much controversy. The changes were not intended to express a change in the conviction of the author and of the teaching of the Church, but like other changes in the same document set forth more recently approved church definitions. The *Variata* has condensed within it on other articles material confessionally stated in the Apology when the objections of the Roman theologians had been stated in the *Confutation*. The change of *distribuantur* into *exhibeantur* had been made already in the Apology, and been ratified by the Wittenberg Concord of 1536."

Dr. Stellhorn, of Columbus, a competent authority, writes, p. 422: "It was maintained that, in the article concerning the free will [in the Saxon Confession], he had yielded to the Papists, and in that concerning the Lord's Supper to the Calvinists; but an accurate investigation will not approve of such a judgment."

It is an undeniable fact that the *Variata* was read and approved by Luther; was officially used at the diets of Worms and Regensburg in

1540, '41, '46; and was not challenged by any Protestant so long as Luther and Melanchthon lived.

Taken as a whole, this article is not up to date, and does not justify the expectations raised by the Editors, pp. VI., 558.

The article on *Pietism* by the same author is much more satisfactory.

3. On p. 46, Dr. Weidner reckons "*receptive* faith" to infants, and "personal faith" to adults. Is not all saving faith *receptive?* Is it not also personal? Our infant faith friends get themselves into more difficulties than they get their followers out of. Not infrequently they make an ambiguous word, sometimes italicized, often of doubtful applicability, count for argument in their discussions. Dr. Weidner ought to have told us that infant faith is not a confessional doctrine. and that it does not have the consent of modern Lutheran theologians.

4. On p. 43, Dr. Weidner makes "the threefold action of applying the water at the recitation of the words," one of the things "necessary to constitute a valid baptism." It would seem that there is something new even in the old Lutheran theology We have looked a little into the teaching of our Church on the form of baptism, but we never before saw it taught as Lutheran that "the threefold act of applying the water," is "necessary to constitute a valid baptism." Our Church has always held that the mode of applying the water is an adiaphoron. Gerhard names "water, the word and the action," as "the three essential parts of baptism." Dr. Weidner must have been reading John of Damascus while preparing to write this article.

5. On page 102, we read: "The Church is a divinely instituted society for the administration of the Word and sacraments." This sounds very like some modern definitions of the Church as an institution of salvation, an organism. It leaves out the fundamental idea of the Church as "the congregation of believers" (Augsb. Conf., Art. VII.), "holy believers" (Schmalkald Art. XII). Let us read into the definition given in the article before us the inspired conception of the Church: "Christ loved the society for the administration of the Word and sacrament," etc. Not even in the interest of Church Polity can we improve on Art. VII. of the Confession.

6. On p. 126, we find a very inadequate description of Private Confession. That in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries such confession was "auricular," in the sense of being spoken into the ear of the minister; that it was private in the sense of sequestered, *unter vier Augen;* that such confession was required as a condition of admission to the Lord s Supper, is simply demonstrable This may be a shadowy part of our history, but it is a part of it, and aught to be told by ourselves rather than be left for others to tell.

7. The article by Prof. Graebner, on Conversion, p 136, is characterized by confusion and contradiction, rather than by clearness and consistency of thought. It is essentially a revival of the Augustinian determinism. It makes conversion "solely and entirely an act of God,"

and holds that man is purely *passive* in conversion. Man can resist the means of grace, but he cannot accept the gift of salvation; as if the natural power to resist precludes the ability to accept under grace?

The article on the same subject by Dr. Stellhorn is more scriptural, but is not free from objections. "Conversion is an act which man is required to do, if he wants to be saved, and at the same time something that when the gospel is preached to him, he can do." So far, so good. Then the author describes conversion as "an act of God," and as "an act of man." So far, so good again. But he fails to tell us clearly that the word "act" must be used in different senses.

We conceive that in conversion God acts and man acts, but they act in different ways,—God as antecessor, giver, performs an *enabling* act. Man as receiver, under grace, performs an *accepting* act, an act determined by his own will, *die innere Willensentscheidung des Menschen*, as Luthardt phrases it. Both of these writers are too much hampered by the old scholastic philosophy. In repentance and conversion the final act of decision is by the will of man. Even to cease to resist requires a decision of the will. There is probably no subject on which the modern Lutheran theologians have more thoroughly modified the old dogmatic standpoint than on that of conversion. (See Luthardt's *Dogmatik*, 7th Ed., 225).

8. On p. 257, Dr. Gerberding says that "regeneration wrought by the spirit [does he mean the Holy Spirit?] through the means of grace is unto faith" We have always thought that "regeneration wrought by the Spirit" is unto holiness, moral renovation, sanctification. Faith is not an end in itself. In the Lutheran system it is simply an instrument. But a more serious objection is that here, and in the article on Regeneration (Dr. Stellhorn, p. 406), regeneration is made to precede justification. This is an inversion and a perversion of the Lutheran order of salvation. "Faith is a divine work in us which transforms and regenerates us from God," says Luther in the Preface to Romans. "Faith brings the Holy Spirit and creates a new life in hearts," says Melanchthon.

This inversion of the order of salvation did not appear in the Lutheran Church until the doctrine of "baptismal regeneration" was thrust into the place of the fourth article, and justification was pushed towards the periphery (See Luthardt, *Dogmatik*, 7th Ed., 285, and Dorner's *Hist. Prot. Theol.*, II., 158, *et seqq.*), and made to take an inferior place. It is inconsistent and illogical to speak of justification as "the fundamental, or principal doctrine," and then postpone it to some other doctrine, or to say that it is comprehended under some other doctrine. Certainly it is contradictory to say in the same breath, p. 406, that "the terms regeneration and conversion are synonymous. The difference between the two may be expressed in this way," etc. When the terms that describe things are synonymous, how can the things be different? There must be confusion somewhere.

In Dr. Jacobs' part of the article on justification, p. 258, it is said: "It (faith) is a personal relation between man and God through Christ." Is it not more correct to say that faith (subjective faith) *establishes* and *maintains* "a personal relation between man and God through Christ"? Again: "Doctrines and precepts appeal to faith and require it." Doctrines and precepts appeal to the rational and moral personality, and demand faith and obedience. This is so whether they be addressed to the regenerate or to the unregenerate.

9. On p. 331, Muhlenberg's relations with non-Lutheran Christians are glossed rather than stated. That Muhlenberg, in writing and "by word of mouth," invited Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Baptist clergymen and their members to attend the dedication of Zion's Church in Philadelphia; that he gave them the best places in the church; that Dr. Peters preached; that M. addressed the visitors as "Catholic spirited Embassadors of Christ"; that he held *Kanzelgemeinschaft* with Whitfield—these are simple matters of official record. Why should these facts be concealed under the observation: "He knew how to combine width of view and cordially of friendship towards those of other communions, with strict adherence to principle"?

10. On pp. 466–7, is an anonymous article which closes thus: "It (the Stuttgart Confession) taught real presence, oral manducation, sacramental union, ubiquity of Christ, participation of unbelievers, in real agreement with the Augs. Conf. and Lutheran teaching." We do not wonder that the author of this article hides his head under anonymity. But we wonder how the editors came to admit the last ten words of that sentence. Oral manducation is neither named nor hinted at in the Augs. Conf., nor can it be shown to be an essential part of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper (see Krauth's *Conservative Reformation*, p. 461–6). It is well known that Melanchthon modified Luther's doctrine of oral manducation at Marburg in 1529, and that he abandoned the doctrine of ubiquity in 1531. The authors of the Form of Concord clashed with each other on the subject of ubiquity. Volipresence, or multivolipresence, has been the prevailing Lutheran conception. If the reader will strike out the last ten words of this cyclopedia article, he will have a correct description of the Stuttgart Confession.

We have thus indicated, rather than criticized, a few of the many points to which attention might be directed. We incidentally noted the following items as we read: P. 165, "Sheier" for Speier, and 1227 for 1527; 211, "Richard" for Richards; 462, The University of Wittenberg was founded in 1502, not in "1500;" 431, "Verified" for versified; 452, Did Lazarus Spengler represent Nurenberg at Augsburg in 1530?; 528, Was Calov a professor at Leipzig?; 340, Is there such a thing as an ecumenical creed? The Nicene Creed is not common to the Greek and Latin Churches in the same form. The *filioque* is one of the grounds of the great schism. The Apostles' Creed and the so-called Athanasian Creed have never had official recognition in the Eastern

churchs; 465, 4th l. from the top, "1539" for 1559: 545, Melanchthon should have been named as the author of the *Wittenberg Concord*; 409, the bracketed paragraph at the end of the article on Reuchlin should be omitted. Melanchthon received his classical training from John Unger and George Simler, not from Reuchlin; 291, Luther "reached Coburg," April 15th, not April 23rd, and returned to Wittenberg, not to "Augsburg," Oct. 13th; 381, Spener was in Dresden five years, not fifteen; 30, 2nd col., l. 17 from top of page, "prescription" for proscription; 308, 2nd col., 7th l. from bottom of page, "observant monks" for obscurant monks; 26, 1st col., l. 13, "neglects" for rejects; 223, 2nd col., it was a mistake to write that "the Luth. Publication Society makes a biennial appropriation of $500" to the Lutheran Historical Society. Such an amount was appropriated in 1895, but none since; 266, Did not Dr. Spaeth fall from charity, when he stigmatized "American Lutheranism" as "shallow, unprincipled"? But we are glad to find at last a General Council theologian (Mr. Haas) declaring, p. 21, that "communion of saints" in the Apostles' Creed did not originally mean "congregation of saints," as Luther interpreted it in the Large Catechism. Mr. Haas is right, and Luther was wrong.

J. W. RICHARD.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.]

Theologia Pectoris: Outlines of Religious Faith Founded on Intuition and Experience. By James Muscutt Hodgson, M. A., D. Sc., D. D., Principal of the Theological Hall of the Congregational Churuhes of Scotland. Edinburg. T. snd T. Clark. pp. 207. Price $1.40.

This book belongs rather to the department of Apologetics than of Dogmatics. It is an attempt to commend, upon the authority of reason, some of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. As stated by the author, "the standpoint is one which discards the conception of any purely objective authority." But having proved the subjective origin and warrant of faith in God, and of belief in divine revelation and inspiration, "the guidance of the inspired writers may be gratefully accepted and the truths they teach will be found to commend themselves to the intelligence and to the moral and spiritual faculties of sincere and earnest thinkers." This tentative position is the only true one for the Apologist, but it seems to be final with our author. When treating of the nature of inspiration he says: "The final appeal of all moral, spiritual and religious matters is to our personal intuitive perception and appreciation of the true and right, the good and divine. Truth cannot be imposed upon the mind by any external authority." "To its claims each one is bound to be loyal in so far as the truth manifested commends itself to his own mind and heart and conscience." He holds, accordingly, that the true foundation for a system of theology is the nature, condition and needs of man, that from these we must find out what is

the ideal condition towards which his spiritual faculties point, and then proceed to consider what has been provided outside of himself as means of attaining what he was meant to be. In discerning the nature of man he maintains forcibly that we have spiritual as well as intellectual and moral faculties, and that the religious is as certainly an element of our being as any other factor in it. He shows that sin has had a perverting influence and made a supernatural help necessary. We need redemption, but that redemption consists in setting up new motions and bringing new stimuli to our native powers.

This position is decidedly Pelagianizing. In his theory of the mediation of Christ he repudiates the doctrine as taught by Anselm, and denies all claims of law and justice in the atonement. "The work of Christ as mediator was to declare to us the Father's love and to convince us of his forgiving grace that was seeking to win and save us from our sin and misery." He abandons the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith. To justify, in the New Testament, means "that the believer is really and truly righteous though not in the sense of being actually and practically free from all sin and possessed of all virtue." "Believers in Christ are counted righteous by God because they are right in spirit." The conclusion to which such conceptions of divine truth tend is best given in the author's own words: "The complete establishment of the kingdom of heaven upon earth will be realized when true brotherly fellowship and coöperation among all who own each other as Christ's disciples are unfettered and all embracing, purged from arbitrary conditions, from all that is formal, traditional and stereotyped, and degraded no longer by prescribed forms and authoritative regulations; when all vestiges of sacerdotalism, sacramentalism and ecclesiastical authority have been got rid of; when universal prevalence of catholicity and charity has put an end to the intolerance of differences whether in opinions, forms of worship or methods of Christian enterprise, when all are content cordially to recognize every Christian brother, and practically to admit that to his own Master he standeth or falleth."

The book will be very helpful to those who want to become acquainted with the trend of theological thought in the Calvinistic Churches in Scotland. It will be of great service also to those who have to deal with skepticism as it exists among the educated in business circles. The busy pastor will find here in a small compass many valuable suggestions as to the positions to be taken and the arguments to be used. The time has come when the minister must preach evidence, not from the pulpit, but in personal work, and he must prepare himself from books like this which deal with fundamental philosophic principles.

L. A. FOX.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York].

Our Lord's Illustrations. One of a series of Bible Class Primers, edited by Principal Salmond, D. D., of Aberdeen. This volume by Rev. Robert R. Resker, King's College, London. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. Paper cover. Illustrated. 136 pp. 20 cents net.

In this little volume, the author has gathered together and classified all the metaphors, emblems, and incidents, and allusions, employed by our Lord to illustrate his teachings. Every reference to objects in nature, to civil, social, or domestic life, to occupations and customs, as well as to Old Testament history, is explained. Such a work is as necessary to intelligent Bible reading, as is a Bible dictionary to critical study. For, to give these illustrations a nineteenth-century setting, is often to miss the real meaning and run a risk of falling into error, The teacher, in particular, will find here fresh thought and helpful material for added interest in the familiar sayings of Jesus.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York].

The Autobiography and Diary of Samuel Davidson, D. D., LL. D. Edited by his Daughter. pp. 350. Price $3.00.

Here is an intensely stimulating revelation of mind and heart. Dr. Davidson's diary was not commenced until he was sixty-seven years of age. This probably accounts for its meager and impressionistic quality in the earlier chapters. It is the sketchy memorabilia of an acute and scholarly student of hermeneutics, who commenced his career as an orthodox Presbyterian, of Irish birth (1806), was made uncomfortable by Calvinistic illiberality of thought, entered the Congregationalist body and became a professor of Hebrew and Biblical Criticism at Lancashire College. By reason of his views of the composite nature of the Pentateuch he was compelled to resign his position despite his declared belief in and warm attachment to all the essential truths of the Christian faith. His German training and intimacy with Tholuck, Neander, Hupfeld, Tischendorf, Bunsen, DeWette, Kalisch, and later, with Pfleiderer of Berlin, at once declares the reality and thoroughness of his scholarship and the plan of his work in Biblical study. His translations from the German and his own well-known introductions to the Old and New Testaments are known to all students. He was a man of positive and aggressive spirit. In this diary he reveals his gradual departure from his orthodox positions of 1848, and his final entrance into the camp of the rationalistic theologians. His piety remained unaffected by his change of view, and he contended for Christian truth, as he understood it, to the last. The autobiography was inspired by a request of his beloved wife, whose loss sounds like a pathetic note through the volume. He died in 1898, at 91 years of age. Dr. Davidson has set down many valuable opinions upon politics, religion, war, the Church, ancient ver-

sions, and Church history, but his later naturalistic interpretations of Scripture though forceful and brilliant, are expressed as results and *obiter dicta* rather. E. H. DELK.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.]

Reconciliation by Incarnation. By Principal D. W. Simon, D. D. pp. 380. Price 3.00

If theology consists simply in the gathering of proof-texts for the buttressing of certain creeds and confestions, then this book will not satisfy the average dogmatician. But if theology is first and foremost the systematic erection of biblical thought into the crowning expression of God's world-plan and work for man, then this book of Principal Simon's must be classed among the finest pieces of Christian thinking which has appeared in either England or America for a decade. It may be well to say as a first word that the author of this book was a pupil of Dorner's and is the translator of his great teacher's monumental work, *History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ.*

Dr. Simon first devotes himself to a statement of the cosmological background of the Incarnation. The need and significance of the Atonement, he thinks, is rather ignored, or misunderstood, because there is no true cosmology presented by many theologians. He places as ultimate factors of the universe-matter, energy and idea (divine plan and laws). He then presents the diversified expressions of the one energy, the idea and its differentiations, and matter and its forms. The author is a theistic evolutionist, but finds a place for a distinct fall of man. Indeed the one great worth of the whole book is in that recognition of the assured results of the best modern anthropology, psychology and ethics in happy balance with the great central truths of biblical teaching concerning the constitution, sin and recovery of man through the energizing of God's redemptive life in Christ. Some idea of the fresh method of statement may be gathered in his chapter on "God as the Environment of man." The relation is a twofold one, says the author. First, "personal," arising out of the cosmological relation of creator to his creature, and secondly, a "bio-dynamic" relation—a vital energizing of the spiritual nature of man, which may be rejected or accepted. The conditioning of this relation is fully presented in chapter VI. of the book. "The Normal Relation between God and Man," and "The Actual relation of Man to God," are found in the two subsequent chapters. Now we approach the heart of Principal Simon's study. Concerning the actual fall of man, he says: "The first mistake frequently made is in exaggerating, not the *significance*, but the *heinousness* af the sin committed by the first man. The older Protestant idea that the firsi man was created not only free from corruption, but possessed and used all inborn perfections of intellect, will, heart and

body; the enjoyment of the blessedness of a perfect paradise; wisdom, sanctity, knowledge, perfect love of God; health, symmetry, and beauty of soul, dominion over nature, impassibility and immortality of body and soul," is modified in the light of recent study, not in the interest of minimizing the *significance* of sin, but in lessening the idea of the *heinousness* of the first man's deviation from the ideal cosmological and personal relation of God to man. A second mistake is made, thinks our author, in treating *heathenism* prior to the advent of Christ and the heathenism since Christ,—especially that which has remained entrenched by Christian influences,—as identical. A third mistake frequently made is that of "ascribing to *individual* members of the race what is true of the *race as a whole.*" A fourth confusion mentioned is that of "identifying every *actual* sin with the *ideal* of sin"

The results of the abnormal personal relation of man to God are next discussed. God is involved in man's abnormal relation. A deistic or pantheistic God would not be seriously affected by man's sin, but out of the person and vital relation which God should sustain in every life springs the sad rift in the lute made by sin. "In place of shedding on him the light of his countenance, and letting him taste of the sweetness of his friendship; instead af trusting and honoring him, God s face is hidden, and he lets him feel his displeasure, his resentment, yea, even his anger and wrath. Both in God's transcendent and immanent relation man's sin has caused a break in the plan and inflow of the divine energy. "Whether the condemnation be termed legal or judicial, or governmental or moral, does not touch the point. In any and every case God regards man in a light, and treats him in a manner, contrary to his own original ideas; in other words, a change admitting of the designation abnormal must be said to have been brought about in God's personal relation to man, through the change is man's personal relation to God." God must therefore make a demand of man. "Refusal—on whatever ground—to require the fulfillment of moral obligations outlaws a man as really as refusal to fulfill them when required. *To claim the performance of duty*—of course, in the right way—*is as truly obligatory as it is obligatory to perform the duty which is prescribed.*" After discussing the older legal and forensic conception of God's relation, he thus states his own point of view: "Let it be repeated that the legal relation of God to man, though abnormal, is righteous, nay more, is personally, that is, ethically necessary."

The first movement toward reconcilliation is taken by God to restore the ideal order. "God must bring home to the human mind his judgment of sin." Humanity on the other hand mnst find its representative to express its grief and satisfaction for broken fellowship. Humanity alone must despair of this fulfillment. The potential man must be made the actual man—the true image of God. Through chapters illuminating aud made forceful by literary and scriptural illustration, the learned author explicates the problem of the rapproachment of man and God.

The last section of the book, The Incarnation of the Divine Word, brings us to the solution of the problem. It is hardly necessary for me to report that Simon's conception of the Incarnation does not stop with the idea that the entrance of The Eternal Logos was merely a cosmological fulfilment of the divine unfolding in humanity. It was that, but something far more. On the way to his conception he makes a study of our Lord's Kenosis—the limitation of divine power and knowledge in order to live in the actual human environment. He is a full believer in the Virgin birth as declared by Matthew and Luke. "The Son of God subjected himself also to human limitations with regard to the *store of energy* which thus constituted him." His relation to man is thus strikingly set forth. "He condemned them with a divine condemnation, or rather freely entered into the divine condemnation which was constantly being pronounced on them. As the things referred to rose above the horizon of consciousness, the first effect naturally must have been a feeling as if they were his own, and as if he therefore were himself under accusation and condemnation." This sence of oneness in grief and transgression springing out of his identification with humanity culminated in his death upon the cross. "Christ made satisfaction or amends for the dishonor done the name of God." It was no heathenish purchase of favor, but a representative filial compensation of God who had already bestowed his favor. Thus the vindication becomes essentially ethical, not merely legal. Thus the bio-dynamic task of the Incarnation is completed, but it remains for individual men to appropriate the divine energy opened up in Christ Jesus. This is accomplished through certain channels—the Church, the Word and the Sacraments, and is evidenced in the exalted consciousness of the Christian people.

It is a propitious sign of the times that such work is being written and read by thoughtful men. The author acknowledges his indebtedness to Drs. Orr, Illingworth, Dorner, but is as genuinely original and profound as his colaborers in Christological thinking. *Reconciliation by Incarnation* is a book for which I have long been waiting, and is as stimulating reading for the preacher as for the theologian. Such reading breeds power.

E. H. DELK.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.]

The Exiles' Book of Consolation (Isaiah 40-66). By Ed. König. M. A., D. D., Professor at the University of Rostock, Translated by Rev. J. A. Selbie, M A. pp. VI., 218.

The questions connected with the unity, the date and place of composition have not yet been finally answered. The discussion is still on. The critics are much divided. There are those who affirm that the Ebed-Tahuch passages, their rhythm, diction and isolation necessitate a partition of Deutero-Isaiah, others contend that the prophecies contend in this portion of the book are partially post-exilic, still others, that

they are wholly post-exilic. The more conservative writers claim that chapters 40-66 were written during the captivity. To this class Prof. König belongs. He of course denies the Isaianicity of Deutero-Isaiah, but he also objects to the post-exilic view. He occupies a middle ground. In the volume before us he reviews the arguments on these points of Sellin, Ley, Lane, Gressman and others, and in some instances makes complete answers to them. In chapter IV., our author gives a synopsis of this part of Isaiah under three divisions: "The Sovereignty of Israel's God over Nature and History; The Extension of God's Salvation by Israel to the end of the earth; and The Recompensing of the Righteous and the Wicked. Here the writer appears at his best. His style is simple, his thoughts thrill and inspire. The book exhibits throughout discrimination and fairness in dealing with the opponent's arguments. We cannot, however, restrain the thought, that some of the objections which the Professor urges against the post-exilic date of composition, lie with equal force against the exilic date, and could be marshalled with little change in favor of the old traditional view, that the entire book is the product of one master mind, and that mind the sublime prophet Isaiah. A copious list of Scripture passages, quoted in the discussion, follows at the end of the volume.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

The Great Sinners of the Bible. By Louis Albert Banks, D. D. Cloth bound. pp. 329. $1.50.

This book contains a series of Sunday night sermons, furnished by the author at the request of the publisher. Dr. Banks seems to have solved successfully the problem of the evening service. The solution will be evident to the reader. The sermons are short, pithy, and personal; not preached to please or attract, but aimed at the conscience of the hearer. The volume contains twenty-eight character-sketches, mostly from the Old Testament. By his clear insight into human nature and his rare faculty of delineating the struggles of the heart, the author has succeeded in putting sin and its sorrows into concrete and tangible form. The characteristics which have made Dr. Banks's former works so popular are here preserved; and the sermons abound with illustrations and quotations of great merit.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK; CURTS AND JENNINGS, CINCINNATI.

Sin. By Randoph S. Foster, D. D., LL. D. A Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Price $3.00.

In this work Dr. Foster's STUDIES IN THEOLOGY has reached its sixth volume. The object of the series is to furish in condensed form the best thought of the most learned and able thinkers in the depart-

ments of philosophy and theology, and the results of the author's own investigation and study. The aim is to help toward a settlement of obscure and disputed points.

The present volume, like those before it, handles the difficult problems in the subject with ability and vigor. It divides the discussion under the heads of Adam, Inclusions of the Creative Act, What is Sin? Guilt, and Punishment. The author is strongly anti-Augustinian and anti-Calvinistic. As to Adam, he holds him to have been created in integrity, with rich and ample endowments, but the endowments were those of faculty—not of concreated treasures of actual knowledge. The creative act is viewed as setting him forth in innocence, and with a bodily and mental constitution in which it was "natural to move freely along the course of joyful obedience and worshipful love." But this did not constitute him righteous. A distinction is claimed between a "moral nature" and a "moral character"—the latter being held to be attainable only by the free action of Adam himself. "Holiness is a quality of a person, resulting from and determinable by a free conformity to a righteous law." With respect to sin, its origin is credited to Adam's misuse of his free-will under temptation. It was his personal act—according to the common faith of the Church. But Dr. Foster carries the principle that personal action is the sphere of sin forward to the question of sin in Adam's posterity and repudiates the applicability of the term sin to natural depravity. He rejects the expressions "inherited sin," "transmitted sin," and the like. He repudiates Pelagianism, and maintains the *fact* of human depravity or corruption, and that it is a result or *consequence* of the Adamic transgression, but that as it comes to men from a source back of their free agency it cannot be in itself sin nor constitute guilt. Sin and guilt exist only when conditions of responsible free agency are reached. In support of these views, with the theological principle and applications they imply, and against the prevalent counter teaching with its presuppositions and bearings, the great body of the discussion is directed. The discussion is conducted with great ability and force. Numerous extended statements and defenses are quoted from writers representative of the prevalent teaching, and subjected to acute, vigorous, and imprefsive criticism. Especially is this the case with respect to the theories of "imputation" of Adam's sin, whether based on realistic view or federal headship. Rarely have the reasons against those theories been put with such clear and effective force.

The work is largely polemic, and its strength is in its close and vigorous analysis and criticism of opposing views, rather than in constructive work. The great questions brought under consideration are of profound importance. This discussion of them is worthy of a place among the able contributions offered for their settlement. Dr. Foster has extended his examination of the place and relations of punishment so as to include its bearings on the doctrine of the atonement. His under-

standing of these bearings leads him decline the satisfaction theory, while in harmony with Wesleyan Methodism, he accepts the Arminian governmental view of the atonement.

It is proper to note a mistake of Dr. Foster in this connection, when he speaks of "the Lutheran position in maintains a doctrine of atonement which, with it universality, must save all men, and which is disproved by the fact that many are not saved." He has misread the Lutheran theology on this point. M. VALENTINE.

Enemies and Evidences of Christianity. Thoughts on Questions of the Hour. By John Duncan Quackenbos, Columbia University, Author of "History of Oriental and Classical Literature." pp. 355. Price $1.50.

Prof. Quackenbos did worthy service when he prepared and delivered at Newburg-on-Lake Sunape, New Hampshire, the addresses whose substance is gathered into the twelve chapters of this volume. He has added a larger service in giving them to the public in the present form. For the discussions are "timely and able, as well characterized by Dr. Sabine in his introduction to the book. The prompting occasion for them is found in the wide and blighting prevalence of religious unrest and error, in which, in our unsettled times, thousands on thousands of persons are led off into absurd un-Christian and pagan follies. There is great need of this trenchant exposure of the wild insanity and demoralizing effect upon personal and social life, from the agnostic, infidel, superstitious, theosophic and heathen substitutes for the Christian faith, now doing their unhappy work.

The first chapter showing the pre-eminent claims of Christianity is followed by chapters impressively laying bare the absurdity of turning away from it to the guidance of Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Mohammedanism, Theosophy, Spiritism, Christian Science, Socialistic Communism, Altruism or Socio-Commercial Love, Agnosticism, with a closing chapter on the Christian Evidences. Prof. Quackenbos writes out of a scholarly acquaintance with the religious as well as the scientific thought of our day, and with great vigor of thought and expression. His discussions cut sharply and deeply into multiform types of prevalent and irrational vagaries. We cannot but think that he has made undue concession to the use and value of hypnotism as a means of physical and moral healing. But even on this his suggestions are interesting. We desire to commend the book. It ought to have a wide reading. M. VALENTINE.

The Foundations of Christian Faith. By Charles W. Rishell, A. M., Ph. D., Prof. of Historical Theology in Boston University School of Theology. Price $3.50.

This is the latest volume of the *Library of Biblical and Theological Literature*, edited by Drs. George R. Crooks and John F. Hurst, a se-

ries of works which has received wide favor, intended to furnish a compendious apparatus for advanced theological study. The eight earlier volumes include such works as Prof. Harman's Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures; Dr. Terry's Biblical Hermeneutics; Crooks and Hurst's Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology; Dr. Bennett's Christian Archæology; Dr. Miley's Systematic Theology, etc. Dr. Rishell's work fully sustains the recognized rank of the series.

The work is distinctly apologetic, and furnishes a vindication of the divine claims of Christainity against the various forms of recent and present skeptical and opposing thought. It does not attempt any novel theory of Christian defense, but what is far better and more serviceable, a review of the various forms and anaphrases of adverse contention, and a presentation of the fully satisfactory answers as required by the completest investigations and best sustained conclusions now reached in religious, philosophical, and scientific knowledge. It is thus a compendious exhibition of the failure of skepticism to justify its objections, and of the positive evidences of the truth of Christianity, as they stand in the best thought of our day.

The method of the work is happily adapted to this aim. After an introduction defining the terms Knowledge, Belief, Faith, and Unbelief, the author reviews the philosophical forms of unbelief, Materialism, Atheism, Agosticism, Pantheism or Monism, the conflicts between scientists and theologians with respect to creation and miracles, the mythical theory of the Gospels, and the various proposed ethical and other substitutes for Christianity. He passes to the more positive view of the claims of Christianity in discussing its doctrines concerning both man and God, the nature and fact of supernatural revelation, the evidential value of miracles, the resurrection of Christ, the superiority and finality of this revelation, and the satisfactory test which it finds in experience and Christian consciousness. The scope of the work is very comprehensive, covering almost every form of recent skeptical thought. The discussion is calm, frank and fair. The author shows himself masterfully at home in the various departments of knowledge and thought required for effective and assuring presentation of the truth. The work is prevailingly marked by clear thinking and just judgment. It abounds in fine examples of discriminating analysis and clear-cut logic. A feature of value is found in the large reference to recent authors on the subject.

The underlying theology of the volume, as understood for this series of the *Biblical and Theological Library*, conforms essentially to the standards of the Methodist Episcopal Church. But the discussion rests on the fundamental Christian views acceptable to all evangelical Churches. Prof. Rishell is keenly alive to scientific progress and to biblical criticism. As far as he yields to them, he regards them as not destroying, but confirming the ground of the Christian apologist. His

volume is a timely and most valuable contribution to our apologetic literature.

M. VALENTINE.

Honey from Many Hives. Gathered by Rev. James Mudge, D. D. pp. 328. $1.00.

The contents of this book are accurately described by the title. It is a volume of extracts from the works of some of the best devotional writers of the Christian Church, with a prefatory chapter by Dr. Mudge on Devotional Reading. Thomas á Kempis, Francis de Sales, Thomas C. Upham, F. W. Faber, Jeremy Taylor, Samual Rutherford are among the writers represented, and the selection from their books and from those of others scarcely less eminent for their spiritual insight and clear statement, have been made with admirable judgment. They are eminently calculated to instruct, admonish, console and cheer. It is a book to be kept close at hand for daily reading, and will doubtless find its way, as it ought, into the homes of many who are desiring a larger, fuller life.

M. H. VALENTINE.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, NEW YORK.

The Development of English Thought: A Study in the Economic Interpretation of History. By Simon M. Patten, Ph. D., Professor of Political Economy, Wharton School of Finance and Economy, University of Pennsylvania. pp. 328. $3.00.

This book is an attempt to present the theory of history through concrete illustrations, and English history is chosen for the purpose because the circumstances isolating England have made her development more uniform than that of her continental neighbors.

The theory on which the discussion proceeds is briefly this: 'there are two groups of ideas, knowledge or sensory ideas brought by the the senses from the environment, and action or motor ideas revealing the self struggling for those relations, to objective things that insure survival' Out of this action and reaction comes the development in thought, institutions and economic conditions. At the basis of race differentiation are climatic causes. Irregular climatic conditions, with uncertain food supplies and rainfall, tend to foster the passive qualities; better and more settled conditions develop self-reliance and aggressiveness. Among the antecedents of English thought, as it has taken concrete shape in institution and society, these effects of material environment are put first. Then follows an snalysis of the influence of the Catholic supremacy, of inventions, of changes in diet and clothing, domicile, and labor, and of the dislocation of old associations and relations introduced by the Reformation. As these successive changes came in they produced new motor reactions, or utilized old ones which had been created by previous efforts to insure survival through adjustment to envirenment, but which were no longer called to act in the old way because the altered environment had obviated the need for them. The

development is then traced through Calvinism, the philosophy of Hobbes, Locke, Mandeville, Hume, Adam Smith, the Methodist revival —all together preparing the way for the more recent economists Malthus, Ricardo, and John Stuart Mill. Darwin, the Oxford movement, and the poets are also related by the author to the development he is seeking to trace, and through this complexity of factors he brings the discussion down to the present with the problems that yet await solution.

The specially unsatisfactory thing in the underlying theory of this book is that it is too mechanical. It approaches very closely to Locke's original denial of innate ideas, and his affirmation that the mind is a *tabula rasa*, and that in a rationally governed man expression should be the exact equivalent of impression. This theory is indeed combatted, and it is shown that Locke himself was forced to modify this extreme position in order to account for the manifest excess of expression over impression, by admitting that reflection on materials furnished by experience gives rise to ideas that have "nothing to do with external objects." Still the relation between sensory and motor action is pressed so vigorously that there is too little conceded to mental initiative to account for the differentiation that has taken place in the development of English thought and economic life. The assertion that sensory powers are modified by heredity is avoiding the problem rather than solving it. The gist of the argument comes out in such statements as these: "Character is formed by the motor reactions which are created by the perception of certain sensory ideas. These motor reactions are the result of hereditary adjustments," p. 12. "The basis of race ideals is the motor reactions that peculiar conditions have produced and heredity continued." "A migrating race will have a more marked national character than a settled race. Passing through more environments the limiting aggregates of each will leave their influence on the national character in the motor reactions they create" p. 18. In case of change of environments, where the limiting aggregate is absent or shows itself in different forms, "we have an inherited motor mechanism without any means of exciting it," p. 19. Development comes through the response of this old motor reaction to a new group of sensory ideas, p. 51.

In harmony with the general drift of the book the conclusions of the associational philosophy of Bain, Mill, and Spencer are accepted as explaining the origin of moral ideas, p. 269. As over against a stable, intuitional and universal morality we have the following: "Morals might be defined as the application of the philosophic deductions of one age to the economic conditions of later ages. We might say that morals are rationalized customs, habits and traditions," p. 266. "Few, if any, ideas are universal. Religious, political, and social ideas

other errors that can hardly be blamed upon the printer or explained as colloquialisms of the characters prompt us to suggest a review of grammar and rhetoric before the next venture. J. A. HIMES.

BERRY BROTHERS, HOMER CITY, PENNSYLVANIA.

Distinguishing Doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. By Rev. John Tomlinson, A. M. pp. 48.

In six brief, but pregnant, chapters, the author discusses "The Doctrine of Original Sin"; "The Doctrine of the Person of Christ"; "The Doctrine of the Nature and Efficacy of the Sacraments"; "The True Doctrine of Baptism"; "The True Doctrine of the Lord's Supper"; "The Doctrine of Justification by Faith."

This little book contains strong meat for men; not much milk for babes. The type of theology is chiefly that of the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century, which is good enough of its kind, but it ought to be tempered by that of the Lutheran dogmaticians of the nineteenth century, who have as good right to be heard on the subject of Lutheran doctrine as their great predecessors of two hundred and fifty years ago. The Lutheran doctrine is not less the Lutheran doctrine when it has been expanded, fructified, enriched, by later thinking, and adapted to new conditions. As we do not live in the environment of the seventeenth century, so we cannot think in the formulae, and use the terms, of the men of the seventeenth century. The author's work is good, but it could have been made better by being made more modern. Mr. Tomlinson is known to be a fine German scholar. We wish he had incorporated into his book the fruits of the study of Thomasius, Frank, Luthardt, *et al.* We commend the Lutheran theology most, when we present its latest legitimate developments, and make it speak the language of our own times. J. W. RICHARD.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY, BOSTON, MASS.

The *Atlantic Monthly* for December contains a number of papers that are valuable; some poetical selections that are veritable gems and some pieces of fiction that are in striking contrast with much of the literature of that class which is lowering the standard of many of the magazines of this period. Among the papers that are particularly bright are "Reform by Humane Touch," by Jacob A. Riis; "Wanted, a Chair of Tent-Making," by Alfred Brown Layman, a paper which the readers of the QUARTERLY will find of special interest; "Is there a Democracy of Studies;" "Poe's Place in American Literature;" "Platonic Friendship" and "French Openmindedness." One of the strongest pieces of fiction that has appeared as a serial in any magazine is "To Have and to Hold" by Mary Johnston, now running as a serial in the *Atlantic.* It is so pure and sweet and strong that on every hand one hears only words of praise for it. We know of no magazine with so many fine

characteristics as the *Atlantic Monthly*, and, while other magazines may come and go, we hope it will go on forever. P. M. BIKLE.

PERRY MASON AND CO , BOSTON, MASS.

The Youth's Companion is growing better every year. Its stories portray the manly and womanly virtues with no sacrifice of interest, and they appeal to the sympathies of the old and young alike. During 1900 it will offer special series of stories—among them being stories of Former Political Campaigns and Adventures of Linemen. Besides these there will be a score of stories for girls by such writers as Sarah Orne Jewett, Mary E. Wilkins, Margaret Deland, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, Edith Wharton, Kate Chapin and Margaret Sangster.

Some of the other contributors will be Frank R. Stockton, who presents a droll story, "The Wolf and the Wheelbarrow"; James Bryce author of "The American Commonwealth," who offers "Hints on Reading"; W. D. Howells and Jane Barlow, each of whom contributes a serial story; and Bret Harte, who recalls an early California experience in "How I Went to the Mines."

The *Companion* calendar for 1900 is unique in form and beautiful in design. It is suitable as an ornament for the pretiest room in the house. It will be sent to all new subscribers. Those wishing to subscribe should address *The Youth's Companion*, Boston, Mass., 203 Columbus Avenue.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The Lutheran Almanac and Year-Book, for the Year of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, 1900 Edited by Rev. Matthias Sheeleigh, D. D. Price 10 cts. a copy or $1.00 per dozen.

This well-known annual comes to us with all the varied information concerning the Church that has made it always so valuable. It ought to be in every Lutheran family. A pastor can serve the Church and his people well by taking steps to place a copy in every home.

of Aristotle and Hegel with regard to logic are discussed and compared, complete the book.

It is an interesting book; and the estimate it gives of the relative importance of the real and ideal in literature and the treatment which should be accorded them is well balanced and devoid of any overweening praise of either alone. The style is good, though in some parts not so clear as might be wished. The first of the two chapters devoted to Herman Grimm furnishes the author an opportunity for a discussion of Raphael's life and work which he improves to advantage. He displays a keen appreciation of his subject, but, we regret to say, lacks at times in closeness and definiteness of treatment. P. M BIKLE.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America. By John Fiske. 2 vols. 1899. pp. 294–400.

These volumes follow in subject matter directly after the author's "Beginnings of New England," and they trace the various events in the history of New Netherland and the Quaker settlement of Pennsylvania. The preliminary resumé in the first two chapters covering a sketch of Dutch history and the influence of the Dutch upon English history, is most interesting, calling attention as it does to facts that throw much light on later events.

The Dutch attempts at colonization and the vicissitudes of the settlers of New Netherland, furnish a fascinating narrative. The author points out fully the fallacy of the idea that our free institutions are of Dutch rather than English origin—a theory whose demolition he seems especially to enjoy. He shows why the Dutch colony languished and suffered so long, as compared with the English settlements. He points out that the government of New Netherland was agreement "of the people, by the Director and Council, for the West India Company," a state of things that made poor soil for developing Dutch liberties. This seems to have constituted the weakness from which New Netherland suffered until it finally fell into English hands. For while already in 1628 the 300 settlers at Plymouth had their own laws and assembly and elected their own governor; and while at the same time the 4,000 widely scattered Virginians had their house of representatives "without whose consent the governor appointed by the crown could not raise so much as a penny by taxation"—the 300 inhabitants compactly placed in New Amsterdam had not so much as a town meeting—and never did have under Dutch rule. Such conditions formed the weakness of New Netherland till it finally fell into English hands.

Penn's Holy Experiment at founding a colony based on principles of self-government far in advance of his day in their liberality, forms a sharp contrast to all that precedes. Mr. Fiske gives a long account of Penn—his career and his peculiar tenets. His estimate of Penn is so high that he views his "weakest point" as being "an occasional slow-

ness in recognizing the bad side of human nature"! The volumes close with an account of the immigration of Jews, Huguenots, Scotch Irish, and Germans. An excellent index is appended.

We wish space were allowed to call attention to some of the very interesting points brought out in these volumes. We meet new facts, new view-points and suggestive theories of events under discussion. The author traces with interest the large bearing that passing and often obscure events among these isolated, disturbed, and often commonplace settlers, have had on the subsequent history of our country. The reader is led along through a fascinating tale of early days, and told a lot of things he never knew before in a way that impresses and charms. We believe many will thank Mr. Fiske for these volumes, as we are here glad to do. We feel, after their perusal, as though we had enjoyed the benefit of a special private talk from the author, an impression due no doubt to the happy style that gives us historical weight without heaviness, and a historical philosophy that does not oppress, uniting critical veracity and a keen sense of historical perspective, and spreading all before us in most vigorous and charming diction.

S. G. VALENTINE.

THE GLEASON PUBLISHING COMPANY, FREMONT, OHIO.

It Was Marlowe. A Story of the Secret of Three Centuries. By Wilbur Gleason Zeigler.

This book appears to have been written primarily as a romance and incidentally to support the theory that Christopher Marlowe and not Francis Bacon was the author of Shakespeare's plays. It may, perhaps, be admitted, without saying much, that as between Bacon and Marlowe we should choose the latter as the more probable author. We should be sorry, however, to convey the impression that our faith in the tradition of three centuries has been in the least disturbed by this romance. To us the story would have been more acceptable without the attachment—it can hardly be called the incorporation—of the new theory. Parts of the story are told with considerable dramatic power, some descriptions of old London are exceedingly well done and the interest of the whole is satisfactorily sustained. The rhetoric is frequently crude. The wrong word is sometimes used and the transitions from the solemn to the familiar style are often startlingly sudden.

On the first page we are told that "a man had paused to *prevent* overtaking the crowd"; on p. 104, occurs the sentence, "With Shakespeare were two others whose lives were inseparably interwoven with *that of* his own and with Marlowe's"; p. 98, tells of "*amelioration* of the darkness"; on p. 127, "temporary" is used for temporizing; on p. 110, we find "thou expurgated"; on p. 236, "*thou* art doubly welcome," addressed to two visitors; on p. 237, "What! croaking ravens, both of thee"? on p. 242, "thou *should* be more circumspect." These and

of any sort meet insuperable barriers as soon as they reach the limits of the environment in which they were produced," p. 49.

Another serious defect in this book is a failure to estimate the profound significance of man's religious nature, and the appeals that are addressed to it. The view here presented of the Lutheran Reformation, of the Calvinistic movement in England, and of the Methodist revival, is wholly superficial, dropping out some of their most charcterizing features. As an example of the way religious processes are dealt with the view presented of conversion serves well. After speaking on pp. 18 and 19 of conversion in general, as any change of ideas, and tracing the phenomenon to a new sensory stimulus appealing to old and unused motor reactions, the author, in speaking of the Wesleyan revival, makes this specific application of his theory to conversion as a religious phenomenon: "Suppressed tendencies or disused motor reactions are the key to the phenomenon of conversion," p. 258.

But while we are unable to agree with some of the presuppositions of this book, or accept its interpretation of many historical, moral and religious movements, we wish to say that it is a book both learned and suggestive. We are much impressed with the method followed, and believe that if a more profound grasp of the elements guided the working of it, it would yield substantial and affirmative conclusions. Dr. Patten has a fine gift for expository writing, his analysis of the views of Locke, Hume, Mandeville, Smith and others, being both acute and luminous. Whether one agrees or disagrees with him it is an intellectual stimulus to follow him through these learned and closely reasoned pages.

M. H. VALENTINE.

MACMILLAN AND COMPANY, 66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

A History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. By Marvin R. Vincent, D. D. pp. 185.

This book is just what its title imports—a history of Textual Criticism. The author shows complete mastery of the subject in hand, and has used his material in the most skillful manner. The scholar will find nothing new in the book, except the order and the way of putting things. But the scholar will be glad to have the facts of Textual Criticism placed before him in such a convenient and readable form. The busy pastor, or casual Bible student, will find quite enough here to make him well acquainted with the subject. The teacher of New Testament Textual Criticism may profitably adopt this as his text-book. The numerous fac-simile specimens of manuscripts, and of printed pages, of the New Testament, add to the interest and intelligibility of the discussions.

The book is a valuable addition to the "New Testament Hand-books" series edited by Shaler Mathews of the University of Chicago.

J. W. RICHARD.

FLEMING H. REVELL CO., CHICAGO, NEW YORK, TORONTO.

Christian Missions and Social Progress. A Sociological Study of Foreign Missions. By Rev. James S. Dennis, D. D. Vol. II., 8vo., pp. viii., 486. Illustrated. Price, $2.50.

This is a monumental work. It has outgrown the author's prospectus, for with the second volume comes the announcement of the third. The first volume was largely apologetic, advancing to a critical study of the evils of the non-Christian world. It turns out that his catalogue was itself a prospectus of what the author had in store, of proof and illustration, for the present volume. The inability of paganism to lift itself, the failure of the ethnic religions and a brilliant chapter on Christianity, the social hope of the nations, concluded volume I.

The second volume presents the effects in detail of mission work in transforming the character, ideas and habits of pagan peoples, and considers the direct contribution in social progress thus reached in the sphere of individual character, family life and philanthropy. The reader has presented to him a volume of testimony which is simply amazing. The work of almost every missionary station on the face of the globe is cited. Every possible phase of human improvement is catalogued, with the direct testimony on the subject. The work of every missionary society in the world is touched upon. We look into the faces of our own Kaiserswerth Deaconesses in Syria. The work of missions in the line of education is evidently reserved for the third volume.

The book is profusely illustrated with full-page reproductions of original photographs. It is a pity that a work so voluminous, so well calculated to become a hand-book in every minister's library, is without an index in each volume. Copious indexes are promised with the third volume, however.

H. C. ALLEMAN.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

The Real and Ideal in Literature. By Frank Preston Stearns. pp. XIII. and 223.

This book consists of a collection of essays, some of them more or less closely related to each other, rather than a logically connected discussion of the subject. The author laments the excessive cry for realism in literature, and argues that only as the ideal shines through and illumines the real, does a production acquire the character of the best literature. He illustrates the necessity for this element by a critical examination of some of the works of our great writers. This general matter is followed by a more particular review of the work of Frederick W. Loring (to whose memory the book is dedicated) and of Herman Grimm and Emerson. Chapters on the "Müller and Whitney Controversy," and on the "Science of Thought," in which latter the teachings

KEE MAR COLLEGE

AND

Music and Art Conservatory,

[CHARTERED 1850,]

Offers Classic, Normal, Music and Art courses for Diploma and Degrees; comprises three large brick buildings situated on a beautiful eminence, a lovely campus, library, apparatus, hot and cold mountain water, steam heat, gas light, electric bells, a suite of rooms nicely furnished for every two or three students, music lessons on Pipe-Organ, Reed Organ, Piano, Violin, Guitar, Mandolin, Banjo, and Cornet.

Lessons in Drawing, Crayoning, Pastel, Oil and China Painting.

German and French languages taught and spoken.

Special attention paid to Elocution and Voice Culture.

Normal course with Diploma for teaching.

Strict attention given to Physical, Social and Religious Culture.

Kee Mar College is located in a most attractive, refined and healthful city of 14,000 people.

Send for catalogue and journal to

REV. C. L. KEEDY, A. M., M. D., President,

HAGERSTOWN, MD.

---

50 YEARS' EXPERIENCE

PATENTS

TRADE MARKS
DESIGNS
COPYRIGHTS &C.

Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain our opinion free whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. Handbook on Patents sent free. Oldest agency for securing patents.

Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive *special notice*, without charge, in the

Scientific American.

A handsomely illustrated weekly. Largest circulation of any scientific journal. Terms, $3 a year; four months, $1. Sold by all newsdealers.

MUNN & Co. 361 Broadway, **New York**

Branch Office, 625 F St., Washington, D. C.

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1900.

ARTICLE I.

LUTHARDT ON CONVERSION.

By Rev. Chas. E. Hay, D. D.

No thoughtful student of church history has failed to deplore the disastrous consequences traceable to the misuse of scriptural language. Especially liable to perversion are the terms employed to describe the various stages and aspects of the process by which man becomes the actual possessor of the blessings proffered in the gospel. Modern methods of evangelizing effort have attached to the word Conversion a narrow and utterly inadequate meaning in the popular mind and led to the charge, passed from lip to lip, that the Lutheran Church does not believe in conversion. Perhaps her pastors, in their anxiety to avoid giving countenance to superficial conceptions of the religious life, have at times been too ready to abandon the use of the term itself in their ministrations, thus needlessly surrendering a part of their Christian and Lutheran birthright. Such timidity would be deplorable in view of the overwhelming practical importance of the change in spiritual condition and prospects which, under any theory, is in some way involved in the term. All the divine benefits bestowed upon man cannot avail for his salvation unless he be "converted," Matt. 18 : 3. The provisions of God's grace must be appropriated and man must be radically changed thereby. Yet it is possible to express all that is involved in the term, Conversion, in a combination of other terms, or by using them separately with an expansion of their

primary significance. This was actually done in the era of the Reformation, as it had been done before by the Apostles. The truth is, that the Lutheran Church demands conversion of the most radical and fundamental sort, and looks with amazement and horror upon the shallow views of those who ring the changes upon the term itself, while allowing the ignorance and conceit of the thoughtless multitude to mark the limitations of its meaning.

It is the purpose of the present paper to present the views of one of the most eminent of living Lutheran theologians, Dr. Christoph Ernst Luthardt, upon this topic, as condensed in two of his works not accessible in complete English dress, *i. e.*, his "Kompendium der Dogmatik" (1886), and his "Glaubenslehre" (1898). The peculiar fitness of Dr. Luthardt to speak upon such a theme will not be questioned. His world-wide reputation as a broad-minded and thoroughly reverent theologian rests upon the most solid foundation. The versatility of his mind and variety of his labors have fitted him to view a subject of this character in every light. For half a century in the chair of a theological professor lecturing upon systematic theology and New Testament exegesis, for nearly forty years editing leading theological journals of Germany, a pulpit orator swaying multitudes by his intensely practical appeals and reaching a wider congregation through numerous volumes of published sermons and through a series of substantial works unexcelled in their lucid exposition of the fundamental truths of Christianity and unrivalled in their popularity, a philosopher wrestling boldly with the great problems of free will and grace so deeply involved in the transformation of sinner into saint,—we feel that he, if any man, is entitled to voice the convictions of the great Lutheran communion upon the doctrine of Conversion.

In both the works before us we find the topic embedded in the general discussion of the personal appropriation of salvation. Under this general subject are first treated the works of the Holy Spirit in Calling and Enlightening. Where these divine offices are not disregarded, we may trace in the recipient a process

of inner transformation, in which it may not always be an easy task to define the limits of divine and human agency.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF CONVERSION.

"Although the Holy Spirit exerts a moral influence upon man in many ways, even while in the state of nature, yet it is only through the gracious renewing agency of the Holy Spirit operating upon his inner volitional life that man is enabled and inclined to turn from sin to God in conversion. This inner process, necessary to salvation in every case, is accordingly made possible only through such gracious agency; and only upon the basis of such agency and by its power can the process reach its consummation through the voluntary decision of man's inner nature.

"The Scriptures describe conversion partly as a work of grace and partly as a work accomplished by man himself. The Old Testament presents it as a work of grace when giving the promise of a new heart and recording earnest prayers for its bestowal, Jer. 24 : 7; Ez. 11 : 19, 36 : 26; Ps. 51 : 12. The same view is clearly involved in the New Testament when it demands the new birth as an absolutely new beginning of life effected in us by the spirit of God, Jn. 3 : 3 ff., describing renewal as an awakening from the dead, Eph. 2 : 5; Col. 2 : 13, and ascribing the whole (work) to grace, I. Cor. 4 : 7, 15 : 10—to grace moreover as working upon man's inward nature and giving new volition, Phil. 1 : 6, 2 : 13; or when repentance, Acts 5 : 31, 11 : 18; II. Tim. 2 : 25, or faith (Jn. 6 : 29 is here quoted by the Dogmaticians) Eph. 1 : 19. 2 : 10, is ascribed to the divine agency and designated a work of God. On the other hand, repentance and faith are required of man as his own doing—"repent and believe"—at every stage of divine revelation. It is represented that he who hears the divine call should and can immediately obey, Ps. 95 : 7 f.; Heb. 4 : 7 ff., and faith is an obedience freely rendered by man, Rom. 1 : 5. Conversion thus appears also (even in Jer. 31 : 18, the passage chiefly relied upon by our old theologians) as man's own deed, on which account ἐπιστρέφειν is used only in the active and middle, never in the

passive voice. The key to the harmonizing of the two classes of passages lies in the inwardly renewing agency of the Holy Spirit, which accompanies the divine word addressed to man, Jn. 6 : 44 ; Lk. 24 : 32 ; Acts 2 : 37, 16 : 14, so that, upon the basis of this divine agency exerted upon him, man may assume either a receptive or a hostile attitude toward the Word, Matt. 23 : 37 ; Jn. 5 : 40, 17 : 6, 8." Komp. p. 254.

THE NECESSITY OF CONVERSION.

"The burden of John the Baptist's message and of the preaching of Christ which immediately followed, was like that of the ancient prophets: Become of a different mind, *i e.*, be converted. The whole revealed plan of salvation, indeed, and especially the mission of Christ himself, must be regarded as a gift bestowed upon man by God; yet the revelation thus made approaches man as a demand, and that a moral demand upon the personal mind and will. It is not new disclosures of certain realms of interesting knowledge which grace offers to bestow, nor quieting sensations and frames of mind, but it is a moral demand, or challenge, addressed to the moral personality in its relation to God. There must be a change in this relation. Christian piety is a demeanor and a demand for such demeanor, not a form of mystical enjoyment. It is moreover, a personal demeanor toward God, since what we call Christianity is personal fellowship with God. The process by which we become Christians must therefore be an inner process within the depths of our own personal moral life, and cannot be merely applied to us in some way without our own personal participation. Sin, which constitutes the actual moral state of man, is alienation of the conscious volition from God. To be a Christian, on the contrary, is to stand in personal fellowship of mind and will with God. The inner process, therefore, through which we become Christians must consist in a transformation of our personal, conscious volitional life from the state of alienation from God into that of fellowship with God, *i. e.*, in a "change of mind" (heart). That is to say, we transfer to God the centre of gravity of our whole inner life and in him secure it again. Thus it was the very essence

of the sin of our first parents, that they ceased to be theocentric; and the same may be said of every sin. Hence the Word of God addresses the personal mind and will of man in the divine summons to turn back again to God—renouncing on the one hand all that is opposed to God, and on the other hand pledging itself to God. Such is the demand made upon all men." Glaubensl., p. 439.

ARE ANY EXEMPT FROM THE NEED OF CONVERSION?

"Must every one be converted? Even those who have been baptized? Is not baptism the divine covenant in which God forgives man's sin and receives him to the fellowship of his grace? And is not baptism also associated with the renunciation of the devil and all his works and with a pledge of fealty to God, and does it not thus involve and give expression to both aspects of conversion itself? And even though we practice baptism in infancy, when there can from the nature of the case be no thought of conversion, yet are we fully persuaded that even infant baptism is not a mere external ceremony or custom of the Church, but a work of God, wrought upon the soul of the child—a work of God, moreover, in which the Holy Spirit effects the beginning of a new life in the soul of the baptized, both a new relation of fellowship and peace with God and the laying of the foundation for a new attitude and demeanor of the actual life toward God—a spiritual parallel thus to the natural birth in its relation to the natural life. But this work of God requires to be taken up by us into our own awakening volitional life and made the personal act of this new individual life. That which baptism by the act of God bestows and effects does not therefore release us from, but on the contrary obligates us to, a corresponding personal demeanor in a change of mind (heart). This may assume various forms according as the individual has remained more or less under the influence of what we designate baptismal grace or has fallen from it. But even though one should have borne himself so correctly as, *e. g.*, Spener, who when interrogated by Canstein as to the sins of his youth could recall only the one fault, that he had, when about twelve years

old, allowed himself to be persuaded to join in a round dance at a public frolic in his merry Alsacian home—even then must every one renounce complicity with the sin abounding on every hand and declare his allegiance to God; and every one must attain an inward personal decision against Satan and for God. And as long as we live in the flesh, must this affirmation and negation continue and be repeated; for we shall all through life be subject to the influence of sin, and compelled of our own knowledge and volition to turn our hearts away from it and toward God. This process is designated in the Scriptures a 'change of mind' (heart); in dogmatics, conversion; in the language of the confessions, repentance.

"The old dogmaticians discriminate between the so-called repentance of the lapsed and that of the faithful, referring in the one case to the fundamental decision marking the beginning of a genuine Christian life and in the other to the daily repentance of those who live as obedient subjects of grace. It makes, of course, a great difference whether we have in view only separate assaults of evil and the original determinative act of renouncing the dominion of sin or a continuous, though oft interrupted, dominion of the spirit of God. To such a harmonious whole must every life attain that would be considered truly Christian. Good resolutions will not suffice." Glaubens., p. 440 f.

CONVERSION AS A WORK AND ACT OF GOD AND ONLY THUS AN ACT ALSO OF MAN.

A change of mind (heart) is in the Scriptures required of man: "Repent," "change your mind," "be converted." And as the Scriptures demand this of us, we also inwardly realize that the demand is pressed home upon us by the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Word; and, failing to meet the demand, we hear the condemning verdict: "Ye would not." If the change demanded be a change of the will, we know that our willing cannot be willed (by another), but *we* must will. Willing is an active thing, not a passive, a matter of freedom in the sense of self-determination. But can we furnish such a will? We all know that we cannot. This is the problem of philosophical

ethics: we ought, but we cannot; it is easy to command, but not to obey. Kant may continue, with his "categorical imperative" and his moral law, to say, "Thou shalt"; but neither he nor any of his followers can tell us how to attain the ability to obey. To preach morality is easy; to enable one to attain morality is difficult. Kant held that there must be a revolution of the most profound principles (controlling the life)—but how this is to be attained neither he nor any one else has been able to show. How shall we be able by the power of our will to change our will itself? We cannot so to speak—lift ourselves out of the ditch. If we are to walk, a stronger hand than ours must lay hold of us and place us upon our feet. A new and higher power must lay hold upon our will and transform it, before it can conduct itself properly in its relation to God. And whoever has been converted knows, that he has not done this, but that God has done it to him, that he should thus have the power over himself to turn himself from sin and to God. The rolling ball can be turned from its course only by the application of some force from without. The Scriptures frequently and in various connections speak of such an influence exerted upon man. "Did not our hearts burn within us," exclaimed the disciples on the road to Emmaus. Of those who listened to the preaching on the great day of Pentecost it is said: "They were cut to the heart"; and of Lydia at Philippi, "God opened her heart." In all these cases there is reference to an act of God, which is in the first instance, as an act, that of God and not of man. In the letter to the church at Laodicea it is said indeed: "I stand at the door and knock"; but that was a congregation of those who were already believers. When reference is made to the act of which we are now speaking, it is not said: "I stand and knock," but, "He opened the heart." It is always an act bearing upon the will—but not a compulsion, which God exerts upon us. The will cannot be compelled—its very office is to *will.* But it may be set in activity; it may be agitated—induced to reverse its purpose. It is possible so to work upon (influence) it, that it shall be able to do what it previously and without such influence could not do. There may be thus not

alone new influences thus exerted upon it, but new impartation of new power. This is not a destruction of the freedom of the will, but the making freedom possible. The determinative influence does not take the place of self-determination; but stops at the boundary-line of self-determination. Man is not deprived of the latter, nor released from it, but it is made possible to him. This does not occur through any power of his own, but it is an effectual impartation of ability, resting upon an actual influence of God, by virtue of which man is not only urged, inclined to choice, and in this sense enabled to decide for God—but the originating factor in securing decision for God is always God's and not man's. In this sense our Confession declares that man is purely passive in conversion, and not in the sense that man conducts himself in a purely receptive way, refrains from action and submits quietly to the influence of God; for to thus quietly submit and let God work upon one is in itself a form of activity, and that the very best activity, upon man's part. He not only *endures*, but *experiences*, the influence of divine grace. Our Church has always been deeply concerned to exalt divine grace alone, and exclude all division of the work of conversion between God and man. "To God alone the glory," has been the watchword. Not that she would thereby exclude the moral activity of man himself from the process: for it is beyond all question that the process of conversion has its course, its stages, its advancing steps, etc., in passing through which there is an inevitable conflict between the flesh and the spirit; and it is self-evident that in this conflict the will of man must be actively engaged. This is insisted upon by the Formula of Concord, as well as, *e. g.*, by Chemnitz its author, who was the first and most influential representative of a Lutheran theology, constructed expressly and positively upon the basis of Melanchthonian dogmatics. The will is thus brought into activity, however, only after it has experienced the first operations of renewing grace.

A certain change in the usage of the term, Conversion, must not be overlooked. It is employed in modern times in a more

concrete sense than formerly, as referring to the experience of the process as above defined, whereas the earlier writers applied it to the first renewing operation of the Spirit of God. Bearing this observation in mind, we shall easily find the solution of various misunderstandings and accusations against the more recent presentation of the doctrine of the Church by (German) Lutheran theologians, who have been unjustly charged with teaching Synergism, *i. e.*, an unscriptural participation of the human will and ability in the work of conversion." Glaubensl., p. 439 ff.

REPENTANCE AS AN ELEMENT OF CONVERSION.

"The inward process of conversion effected by God begins in the self-condemnation of Repentance, which consists in the change for mind (heart) wrought by the knowledge of sin, sorrow for sin, and serious determination to forsake sin in order to live unto God. * * * Repentance is in the Scriptures represented as the laying of the foundation of the new life within." Komp., p. 259.

USAGE OF THE TERM, REPENTANCE.

"If we regard conversion as two-sided, a turning away from sin and toward God, then we have in Repentance the first, or negative element, while the positive element is designated Faith. But the usage of the term Repentance has suffered a modification since the days of the Reformation. Employed originally in a legal sense and as signifying an atoning work, the word was at first transferred decidedly to the sphere of the inner life and, as an amendment (comparative of "bass": good), understood in the sense of conversion, embracing thus the two elements of amendment or conversion, *i. e.*, penitence and faith. The Augsburg Confession and our older dogmaticians use the word in this sense when they describe conversion as expressing not the active divine factor, but rather the psychological process of internal moral change. In this sense, penitence is regarded as a part of repentance, and the word "repentance" (Busse) itself used in the sense of penitence. Luther in his first Thesis called

attention to this in opposition to the prevailing usage in the Romish Church. "Repentance" had come to be regarded as essentially equivalent to ecclesiastical confession and the confessional, which professed to lead men upon the way of salvation, since it imposed as an atonement for sin, works of satisfaction, by the performance of which man might secure justification. To this, Luther opposed his Thesis I.: The entire life should be true repentance, supplanting thus the limitation of the term to the penitential exercises of a few moments observed in obedience to the requirements of the hierarchical institution of the Church. Thus Luther, following the usage of the Scriptures, transferred repentance from the sphere of outward works to that of inward change, of heart. In harmony with this must we conceive the

NATURE OF REPENTANCE.

By repentance we therefore understand not merely a certain feeling or emotion, indicating thus a merely psychical process or a nervous sensation, corresponding to the modern sense of the word "awakening" or "revival" in the methodistic sense; but a moral process, taking place in the depths of the individual life, and therefore fundamental in character—a process, accordingly, whose genuineness does not depend upon the strength of the emotion experienced nor upon separate manifestations of emotion, and hence cannot be measured by the quantity of flowing tears nor by the violence of bodily convulsions, but upon the moral earnestness and unreserved completeness of the self-comdemnation, extending not only to certain acts, which occasion sensations peculiarly unpleasant and even painful, but to the entire moral condition and inner character, including therefore original as well as actual sin.

A psychological analysis of repentance will reveal the following elements: 1. and chiefly, the *knowledge of sin* and its guilt not merely as theoretical and general, but as a practical reality, involving personal conviction and individual responsibility. This knowledge does not allow us to occupy a position of indifferent neutrality, but places us and our sin in a distinct 2.

Relation to God, as the God of holiness and love—to his holiness, which it sets in contrast with our transgressions and thus awakens within us the terrors of conscience, leading us to dread his wrath; and to his love, in view of which it presents our sin as ingratitude, thus awakening pain and grief. * * * This setting forth of sin in its relation to God leads to 3. *Humiliation* before him, in which we consider ourselves as utterly unworthy of his regard seeing and acknowleging no good in ourselves, and crying: "I am no more worthy to be called thy son." This breaks down all our pride and confidence in self, and thus effects an inner severance between us and our sins. Such sense of unworthiness in God's sight seeks expression in 4. *Confession* before him, in which we roundly and utterly condemn ourselves and lay open before God our inmost thoughts and feelings, Jn. 3 : 20 ff., Eph. 5 : 13. That which stirs and oppresses the heart may now naturally find utterance in the oral confession of particular sins, which our Church's Confession has therefore retained, although it has for the most part been abandoned in practice, having degenerated into an eternal formality and thus lost its solemnity. It still remains, however, on psychological grounds, a necessary requirement of true repentance, that we at least seek out those whom we have injured in order to acknowlege our wrong doing and secure pardon at their hands, thus restoring right relations between them and ourselves, as the Lord has himself directed, Matt. 5 : 23 ff. There has thus been perpetuated the very commendable custom among believers of mutually seeking pardon of one another before approaching the Table of the Lord. With the confession of wrong-doing is by a natural necessity, connected a 5. *Purpose of amendment.* This attests the sincerity of the repentance, and furnishes the negative presumption involved in the plea for pardon, as the plea itself implies the existence of faith that the pardon implored will be granted. Thus repentance finds utterance in faith—at least according to the traditional mode of presenting the doctrine and conducting catechetical instruction.

Some modern theologians, indeed (the Ritschlian school), re-

verse the order, placing faith before repentance. It is claimed that Luther at first advocated this order and was only in later years induced to change it under the influence of Melanchthon, who, it is said, was driven by his sad experience of the low condition of morality among the common people to fall back upon the early Romish system of legality. This led, it is claimed, to the false doctrine of Pietism in regard to the penitential struggle necessarily preceding faith, and all the extravagances which have been associated with that doctrine. The drastic method thus introduced is now to be supplanted by reliance upon the educational work of the Church, which leads from faith to faith, and thus itself presupposes faith.

But it is overlooked by these teachers, that our old theologians speak of two kinds of repentance—that of the lapsed and that of the faithful, *i. e.*, of the repentance by which the state of grace is first attained in our personal life, and that by which such a state is maintained and continually renewed. The entire revealed plan of salvation involves the order: law and gospel, Moses and Christ, *i. e.*, repentance and faith. Thus also Luther arranged his Smaller Catechism, placing the Decalogue before the three articles setting forth Christian faith; and all utterances of the Reformer not in apparent harmony with this order must be interpreted in the light of this fundamental confession (see the last article of Lipsius' upon Luther's Doctrine of Repentance). It is to be feared that under the new mode of presenting these important doctrines, less emphasis would be laid upon the serious nature of sin and its merited condemnation. Sin as an offence against God must meet a verdict of condemnation in our own hearts and secure forgiveness before we can venture to approach God with even an imploring faith. Before the prodigal son ventured, hoping in his father's love, to arise and seek his father's house, he had under the stern discipline of his trying experiences inwardly freed himself from the sin of disobedience, and the words uttered in humble confession and with the plea for forgiveness were only a revelation of the inner self-condemnation, which lay at the basis of his faith in the forgiveness to be attained. God is not only a God of tender

love always ready to forgive, but also a holy and zealous God, who hates sin and is angry with the sinner. Before we can summon courage to believe in the love of God, we must first have gained a heart-felt conviction of his inflexible holiness. Otherwise we have but a superficial Christianity, which does not regard sin in a serious light, but consoles itself too readily with the thought of the divine benevolence. We have thus already implied the

MEANS BY WHICH REPENTANCE IS PRODUCED.

The ancient doctrine of our church touching law and gospel commonly refers repentance to the law as its producing cause, and faith to the gospel. But should we not "know nothing but Christ only"? What have we to do with Moses? It would so appear from early utterances of Luther in opposition to the Romish system of legality. This view was taken of the matter also by theologians of the so-called Antinomian tendency (Agricola of Eisleben). Moses, it was said, belongs in the hall of justice, not upon the pulpit. The pulpit must know only of Christ, and hence teach even repentance only from the gospel. It is said to have been the error of Melanchthon, to esteem the preaching of the law necessary for the restraint of the rude populace making it therefore an essential part of the church's teaching for the common people; and Luther at length followed him in this, although in adopting such an arrangement of the doctrine he departed from his own earlier teaching. It is indeed true that pedagogic considerations were always for Melanchthon of controlling importance, and we cannot to the present day ignore them in view of the actual conditions existing in the congregational life of the Empirical Church. But it must be remembered that Luther himself never lost sight of these, as is evident from his labors in the exposition of the Decalogue; and his later emphasis upon the law in the application of the order of salvation to the needs of the individual soul was not an aberration from, but entirely in harmony with, his earlier principles. In his discussions, "Against the Antinomians," he merely repeated and emphasized the fundamental positions which he had

maintained from the first, and the decision of this point of controversy in the Formula of Concord (Artt. IV. and V.) moves entirely along the same line. But the preaching of the law for the awakening of repentance is not severed from the preaching of Christ, nor to be at all restricted to the "thunders of Sinai." On the contrary, Christ crucified must ever remain the central-point. Yet the cross of Christ stands in a double relation and the preaching of the cross is two-fold: for as the death upon the cross is the highest revelation of the forgiving love of God, it is at the same time the severest arraignment of sin and its most overwhelming condemnation, and thus—if, as our Confession teaches, the law is everything which convinces us of sin—the most pungent preaching of the law. Nothing else can be vividly set before us our sins, or so thoroughly humiliate us, as the "Sacred Head now wounded." It is indeed true, that our heart and lips should be so full of the doctrine of the cross, that we really know nothing but Christ crucified, and are ever recurring to it; but this doctrine is at once our severest accuser and judge, and, if we suffer ourselves to be judged and humiliated by it, our comforter, lifting us up and assuring us of the grace of God.

Such would be the NORMAL COURSE, the inner process of transformation being carried forward harmoniously in penitent recognition and renunciation of our sinfulness until its aim be accomplished. But we all know how far the life of the believer falls below the ideal of such an unimpeded progress, and how many interruptions are experienced—in weak surrender of purpose, in the lack of complete self-condemnation, in serious relapses. There are perhaps some particular besetting sins which shun the light and are still cherished in secret, and in consequence the conflict becomes less strenuous: the conscience is not entirely free and there rests, as it were, a restraining curse upon the development of the incipient Christian life, making it impossible for it to attain to the full freedom and joyousness of a consciously progressing Christian development. Yet the heart cannot attain peace until it can pronounce a full and complete "No" and "Yes"—No to sin, and yes to Christ, *i. e.*, until conversion has

become a reality in repentance and faith; for beginning in repentance

CONVERSION IS COMPLETED IN FAITH.

As repentance is the beginning of conversion, the penitent turning of the soul away from sin involves, at least in aim, an inward turning toward Christ. And if the entire inward transformation is a work of the Holy Spirit, this is to be affirmed particularly of faith, as the aim of this inward movement. Salvation in the day of judgment, as St. Paul explains in the vivid discourse, Rom. 10: 14 ff., presupposes that one call upon the name of the Lord; this again presupposes the word of gospel proclamation, which awakens faith. Thus faith is a work of the Word of God, and furthermore, as the apostle reminds us, Col. 2 : 12 in analogy with the Work of God by which he raised up Christ from the Dead, the working of a new life through the power of God himself. Yet, on the other hand, we ourselves must believe, just as well as we must ourselves repent and be converted (German reflexive—sich bekehren), on which account the apostle is fond of describing faith as obedience (*e. g.*, Rom. 1 : 5). But obedience must be rendered by every man for himself. Faith is therefore at the same time God's work and man's—the work of God in so far as he through his Word effectually makes possible faith as well as repentance, our work in so far as we, thereupon and in the power of the divine act, conduct ourselves accordingly. It is, further, a personal activity, in which is engaged not merely some one endowment or power of our inward nature, but the whole and the profoundest depths of our nature—what the Scriptures call the "heart," *i. e.*, our inward personal life, in which knowlege and will are combined. It is therefore also a universal moral activity alike possible to all, in which the Jew does not act as a Jew nor the heathen as such, but man as a personality everywhere the same. The Apostle Paul never wearies of emphasizing this truth. But the form of this activity upon our part corresponds with the activity of God toward us in the Word. For faith, and nothing else, gives appropriate response to the Word; and as it is the heart of God

which opens itself to us in his offer of grace so is it our heart which opens and offers itself to God in faith."—Glaubensl., p. 443 ff.

In the attainment of faith, Conversion has reached its consummation. Thenceforth, the obedient subject of divine grace walks in newness of life, a new creature in Christ Jesus. The happy results of the great change effected are seen in his *justification* before the throne of infinite justice, so abundantly attested by the divine Word and the inner witness of the Spirit, in the conscious *vital union* with God in Christ, and in process of *sanctification*, by which the happy believer grows daily in likeness to his Master and in fitness for the varied service awaiting him in the association of the saints on earth, whose great mission it is to labor for the conversion of the world to Christ.

ARTICLE II.

THE PEW AND PULPIT OF TO-DAY.

By Rev. M. L. Young, Ph. D.

In the discussion of questions relating to the pulpit and pew, inefficiency, incompetency, lack of adaptability and various other alleged short-comings on the part of the preacher have been emphasized as principal reasons why greater success has not attended the work of the ministry. In searching for the cause of failure many eyes have been turned to the pulpit. Under the scrutiny of critical and hyper-critical occupants of the pew as well as of censors among the clergy, the abuses and faults of preachers, as individuals, or as a class, have been unduly emphasized. Too often has the burden of the blame for not reaching the masses, the non-attendance of young men at church services, decreasing membership and increasing worldliness in congregations, fallen upon the ministry. The growing frequency of ministerial changes, exacting demands upon the preacher and pastor and cutting down of salaries, are attributable, in the opinion of many, to the character of the ministry which, it is declared, has declined in ability and is wanting in adaptability to the needs of the day. The habit of making the

minister a scapegoat for all the wrongs, real or imaginary, in a congregation is sometimes carried to a ludicrous extreme. The style of dress, the gait, the gestures or even the manner of pronouncing words, has brought upon many a faithful minister opposition sufficiently strong to cause his resignation.

Quite enough has been written on the weakness and declension of the pulpit. Its failings may be admitted, but in magnifying them there is danger of losing sight of obstacles to the Church's progress to be found in the pew. It is not amiss to inquire whether the cause of religion may not be sadly hurt and hindered by incompetency, neglect and devilishness in the pew. The time has come for the discussion of causes of declension in the pew, elements of power or weakness in the congregation, the dead-line among church members and kindred themes.

In considering the pew of to-day we notice, first, its ignorance. This may be considered a bold characterization of the ordinary church of our time. It may be said we are living in the great noontide of civilization, that the hour of highest attainment in scientific and literary knowledge has come, that educational advantages and facilities are more general than ever before in the history of the world. It is true that there has been advancement in secular education. We know more than ever of externals. We have been giving attention to husks and shells. We have learned much from the volume of nature, and this is an important part of education, but if it be true that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom" and the question of Job, "Whence cometh wisdom and where is the place of understanding?" has as a correct answer that "The fear of the Lord that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding," then men are ignorant until they know and obey God's word. There is lamentable ignorance of the simple truths of Scripture and even of the questions relating to the Scriptures. In the congregation of average intelligence, not a half dozen members know the difference between higher criticism and church polity.

The lack of information concerning the truths of the Bible is more general in the city than the country. The average farmer

and his family probably know more of the Bible than the business man who is absorbed in the work of buying and selling and whose family devote much time to society, yet it is a painful and humiliating fact that the boys and girls in the homes of the Church and in the Sunday schools generally are getting only the merest jumble of Bible knowledge.

The results of investigation recently made by Prof. Coe, of Northwestern University, a leading Methodist institution, are significant. He put a few simple questions about the Bible to nearly a hundred college students who enjoyed such instruction as the average Sunday school and home afford. The questions were as follows: 1. What is the Pentateuch? 2. What is the higher criticism of the Scriptures? 3. Does the book of Jude belong to the New Testament or to the Old? 4. Name one of the Patriarchs of the Old Testament. 5. Name one of the Judges of the Old Testament. 6. Name three of the kings of Israel. 7. Name three prophets. 8. Give one of the Beatitudes. 9. Quote a verse from the letter to the Romans. Only eight persons answered the nine questions; only thirteen answered eight questions correctly. The average student was able to answer only about one-half of the questions. Ignorance existed where knowledge should be expected. The reason why young people are not informed in Scripture truth may be found in parental neglect and indifference in regard to the religious training of their children. The men and women in our pews, failing to give attention to the history and doctrine taught by the Church, do not train up their children in the way they should go.

In our age, characterized by hurry and bustle, the time-honored methods of careful religious instruction of the young, used with blessed results by the fathers, are considered old-fogyish. The non-Christian and secularizing systems of education prevalent in our day have driven away many from the Church's incomparable methods of early training tried and approved in the centuries gone. We need not wonder at the ignorance of highest truth manifest among the young, when in the text books of the schools which they attend we must make diligent search to

find the name of God. Church members have come to regard modern popular education with such high favor that they give preference to purely secular schools and deem it more important that their children should be regular and prompt in attendance at the day school than at the Sunday school or class for religious instruction. There has been a loss in loosening the reins of family government which in times past required the memorizing of Scripture in youth. The knowledge of God's word gained in the home and Church is the influence to which many of our greatest men attribute the shaping of their characters and their usefulness in life, but the methods of instruction which had such beneficent effect in days gone by are no longer popular. The lack of Scripture knowledge in the pew and the neglect of the use of means by which true enlightenment may be received, continue in spite of the entreaties from the pulpit to give attention to family instruction and the offers of ministers to teach the young.

The awaking of some of the leading educators of our country to a sense of the peril involved in the neglect of the moral and religious training of the young, is a hopeful indication. Words of warning are spoken by such scholarly and influential teachers as President Harper of Chicago University, who says: "It is difficult to prophesy what the result of our present method of educating the youth will be in fifty years. We are training the mind in our public schools, but the moral side in the child's nature is almost entirely neglected. The Roman Catholic Church insists on remedying this manifest evil, but our Protestant churches seem to ignore it completely. They expect the Sunday school to make good what our public schools leave undone, and the consequence is that we overlook a danger as real and as great as any we have had to face."

Another thing to be mentioned as we look at the pew is the secular spirit which pervades it. This is the spirit of the times which in its outbreathing has descended with blighting power upon every good institution. The hearts of many go after covetousness. Mammonism is an evil which has tainted many a church member. The excitement, feverish haste and rash ad-

venture of our day find their impulse in the greed for gold. And so from Monday morning till Saturday night there is a rush for material possessions. Our beastly prosperity has made difficult the endeavor to give attention to our spiritual well-being

The late Bishop Coxe severely characterized materialistic tendencies among church people when he said, in referring to persons who were getting gain by extortion in business enterprises: "If men engaged in these affairs six days in every seven, consent to go up to the temple on the seventh, we may be sure they carry their tables with them and set them up in the holy place as really as did those of old, who turned the house of prayer into a den of thieves. What power can 'the pulpit' have with these? Nothing less than 'the whip of small cords' can purge away such dross and squalor. But you say those are the vices of the cities ; nay, the town has infected the country. Everywhere the newspaper becomes the Bible of the people and everywhere is this same haste to be rich."

With the vast accumulation of wealth, especially in our country, and the material possessions which have come into the hands of church members, the money power has become dictatorial and seeks supremacy over God's heritage. It is not of rare occurrenee to see a rich man or a coterie of rich men running a church, and sometimes pastors are elected and dismissed and the affairs of the Church are controlled by a man or a few men of large means who are not even members, and whose lives are far beneath the standard of ordinary morality. The subserviency of an entire congregation to a godless man who assumes leadership in a church is a pitiable condition.

Akin to the money power which is seeking to control the affairs of the Church is the whiskey king. The rule of rum in politics is despotic. Legislation in municipality and state is shaped at the dictation of this power. The favor of judges and even of the chief executive of the nation is given to this ruinous ruler.

This greatest enemy of the home and of public weal is not satisfied with the ascendency gained in civic affairs, but presumes to lay strong hands on the Church. Are there not con-

gregations which will have no word of censure spoken to the friend of the saloon in the Church? Are there not congregations which bridle the tongue of the pastor, forbidding him to utter words of denunciation against the rum traffic? The freedom of speech is denied because, forsooth, a rich rumseller sits in the pew. Some who are in high places in the Church apologize for the commander-in-chief of our army because he declines to protect our boys from the curse of the canteen. The saloon is aggressive and seeks to make the Church an ally in its work of destruction.

This is the day when the evils of indulgence in strong drink and of the liquor traffic are more clearly exposed than ever before. This is the day when there is less excuse for these evils than ever before. At such a time complicity of the pew with this great enemy of the Church is sin of deepest dye.

But we pass to another aspect of the modern pew—its irreverence. There is a tendency to regard the church as a place of entertainment; so fine music—the nearer it approaches the operatic the better—is the great attraction in the church service. Something new, pleasing, is looked for. The sermon must be short, racy. Everything must be so shaped that the young will be entertained and amused. Ian Maclaren, in a recent number of the *Ladies' Home Journal*, calls attention to the marked change in the demands of the pew. He says: "The centre of thought has shifted from eternity to time. * * * The ancient fear of God seems to have departed entirely and with it the sense of the unseen which once constituted the spirit of worship," and he closes with these earnest words: "The Church triumphed by her faith, her holiness, her courage, and by these high virtues she must stand in this age also. She is the witness of immortality, the spiritual home of souls, the servant of the poor, the protector of the friendless, and if she sinks into a place of second-rate entertainment, then it were better that her history should close, for without her spiritual visions and austere ideals the Church is not worth preserving."

With the loss of a sense of eternal verities has come the profanation of the Lord's day. It seems to be no longer a matter

of conscience even for officers of the Church to start on a business or pleasure trip on Sunday, while the reading of the Sunday paper has become general in Christian homes. There has been a rapid increase of Sunday travel induced by the low rates of fare which railway companies offer for that day. This secularization of the Christian Sabbath is a growing evil and the best evidence of the spiritual declension which results from it is the ready apology made for such desecration. The argument of expediency, necessity and changed conditions of society is thought by many to be stronger than God's word, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." The indifference concerning the abuse, in manifold forms, of time set apart for the special service and worship of God—holy time—and the existence of lax Sunday laws are indices of declension in spiritual life among those who are called to be the supporters of the proper observance of God's day.

There are marks more clearly distinctive of the pew of our day—a pew which differs widely from that of the fathers. Once learning and efficiency, as the fruit of mature age, were highly esteemed in the churches. Now it is more difficult for the average doctor of divinity, though a man of ripe scholarship and wisdom which come with diligent study and experience, and of natural force unabated, than for a young man, fresh from the theological seminary to become settled in a desirable field of labor. Indeed some leading parishes, tacitly or openly, inform the Church that no candidate over the age of forty years will be considered. This setting aside of aged ministers is attributable to the general opinion among church members that young men possess drawing qualities. The captious spirit, now widely prevalent, emphasizes the secular side of the preacher's work and thus we are confronted with the condition which, as one says, demands "that the sermon be made palatable and pleasant, rather than clear, convincing and rebuking—the faithful presentation and application of divine truth to human sin and the highest needs of man. Hence the selection of pastors on these secular and superficial grounds, as a matter of ecclesiastical business only, and in the light of the merely temporal needs

of the Church, such selection often being made by the Christian membership of the Church in the light of the judgment and demands of the outside, worldly community. Thus are the clerical character and office equally lowered in the view of both the Church and the world and the way fully opened for one gradual decadence of spiritual tone."

In our day the proportion of mere pew-holders among the church membership is large. There are persons who are hearers only. They are not concerned in the spiritual condition of the Church—its real life is no care to them. They never pray for the Church, never make any sacrifice for its interests, never devise any plans for carrying to success the true work of the Church.

Among the most discouraging features of church work is the unwillingness of the pew to coöperate in practical personal effort to save souls. Few members will consent to come into such close contact with the unsaved as is needed to give assurance of a vital interest in the spiritual welfare of mankind—Many, it is true, will give of their means to aid any movement for the evangelization of the masses, but beg to be excused from bearing the gospel personally to the unenlightened and erring. To talk to a man about his soul, to bear witness of the love and grace of Jesus, seem to be considered very generally as duties not belonging to the ordinary Christian; but surely following Christ means bearing the light to those who are dying in darkness by our side, toiling to win men from Satan to God—The personal endeavor to bring men to Christ needs be put forth with glowing energy by increased numbers in order to make the pew such a mighty agency for the elevation of humanity as God designed it to be.

A condition alien to the spirit of our Saviour is witnessed in the moving of churches from sections of our cities where the greatest spiritual destitution exists. In some parts of the large cities we do not find the preaching of the gospel to the poor as the sign that the Messiah has come. Provision is rather made for the rich. The sections in which the wealthy and fashionable people live are sometimes crowded with churches while in

large areas containing the abodes of the poor not a single church is found. The unwillingness to make personal efforts in behalf of the poor who are outside the fold of Christ begets a spirit of exclusiveness. In some congregations this spirit is so pronounced that only well-to-do people are cordially welcomed to membership.

When church membership is regarded as little more than a passport to good society, or a means for maintaining respectability, it has drifted far from the unworldly aim and life of the Apostolic Church. The disciples of the first centuries were little affected by the sordid, pleasure-seeking age in which they lived. They were not "of the world." In our times when persecution is scarcely known in Christian lands, the Church is influenced largely by the world.

The pew partakes of the general character of religion and morality existing in the community and country, and the moral status of our land does not differ widely from that of other closely related nationalities, especially the English people for whom we have lately developed the warmest affection. Dean Farrar, in a recent article, gives us a view of present-day England. He says: "It is not possible to be content with the state of things in England. The alarming spread of betting and gambling among workingmen and the youths of great cities—so that this ruinous vice helps to fill our prisons, and (in the north of England especially) has ruined the healthy influence of our games; the eager love of money which leads to much wild speculation and commercial dishonesty; the cruel indifference with which we degrade the helpless childhood of the world by deluging savage tribes with drink, the growth of Hoolyganism, and crimes of brutal violence, the dominance of a selfishness which immerses itself in luxury, pleasure and amusement, while a poverty more and more squalid welters almost at the doors of the wealthy; the growth of a sullen and angry feeling of discontent among thousands of the poorer class; the decay of faith in the deepest and most awfully vital truth, the ever abiding and infinitely loathsome curse of drink, which seems, among women at any rate, to be gaining rather than losing ground,

and as Pope Leo XIII. says, 'drags unnumbered souls to perdition;' the tendency to substitute niggling nullities and fetish worshipping superstitions for 'religion pure and undefiled'—all these things give serious ground for disquietude." Such condition of public morals, the counterpart of which we find in our own country, gives color to the religious life of the pew.

The pulpit has defects and shortcomings but it has not deteriorated as much as the pew. Who will gainsay the opinion of Prof. Hunt who declares: "The evangelistic Christian pulpit of the English world is as able and efficient today as it has ever been and as well adapted as ever to meet the ever new and trying conditions that confront it. In America, especially, there has never been a worthier ministry than there is at this moment—a ministry called upon to face issues and overcome obstacles of which the earlier clergy never dreamed, and before which they would have been, humanly speaking, utterly powerless. Never have we had a brainier and a braver ministry."

The demands made upon the pulpit to-day are such as no other profession is called to meet. The intellectual work required is far more comprehensive and constant than that of any other man of letters. Lawyers, teachers and editors confine their efforts to one line of work in their calling. There are many departments in the professions of law, teaching and journalism, and no man now undertakes to compass the entire field of knowledge in any of these professions, but the minister, besides preaching, is expected to do many other things. He must prepare weekly lectures, instruct the young, make pastoral calls, perform social functions, serve as general director of the church's activities, keep himself informed on the questions of the day. Exactions are made not only upon the minister himself, but upon his family as well. The time and energy necessary for the performance of his manifold duties do not have proper consideration. The labor involved in the preparation of sermons is not appreciated. The writer heard an influential layman, in a public address, estimate the time required for the preparation of a sermon at two hours

and a half. Two days and a half is a more correct estimate of the time needed for preparing a sermon worthy of the name.

An unreasonable demand made upon the ministry is to preach sermons interesting and popular for persons who have little sympathy with the truth, will not receive the word in meekness, nor become true "helpers in Christ Jesus." One truly says: When to the mental and spiritual exactions of the ministry there is joined an irresponsive and inactive constituency enough is added to break the back and break the heart of any man. In the light of this fact the perpetuity of the Christian Church is one of the miracles of modern Christendom.

Notwithstanding encroachments and demands upon the pulpit, inconsiderate or unreasonable, and the impatience with which some hear the old doctrines of sin and salvation, the preaching of to-day is, in general, an unquestioned and clear-toned bearing of God's message to men. The pulpit dare not be weak in its convictions of the holiness of God nor the sinfulness of man, nor give less emphasis than in the past to the preaching of God's word as the means of conversion from sin to holiness.

Greater stress must be put upon the place which preaching occupies as an instrumentality in God's hands for the evangelization of the world. The press and the platform must appear as insignificant moral agencies as compared with the pulpit. The pulpit is the high place from which God's messages are delivered to lost mankind, infinitely higher than the position of teacher, barrister, sage or statesman. The man in the pulpit is God's "messenger"; he comes to men clothed with authority. Conscious of his mission he bears the truth to the hearts of those who will hear, with such convincing power as always accompanies the utterance of personal belief. To-day when human knowledge and wisdom are exalted the pulpit must not lose sight of that which constitutes its foundation, its strength, its permanence, its glory. Divine revelation is the basis, the pillar, the capstone of the pulpit. God's truth, vitalized, issuing from a living experience has the strange power of moving and drawing men.

In our day the essential elements in preaching, truth and personality, are not to be undervalued. A ministry characterized by deep piety, physical and intellectual energy, moral courage, strong common sense, and unwearied consecration, needed in every age, is the special need of our day.

The theme of the ages is Christ. The preaching of morality without Christ as motive and example will not satisfy the longing of sincere souls in any age. To preach Christ is the only effective way of preaching morality in all its bearings on human weal. Christ is the proper theme for this age. Christ the Son of God, the Lamb of God, the divine sacrifice for sin and the victor over sin for every one who believes, is to be proclaimed in this age with all the power of consecrated intellect and heart. The atonement is the theme best adapted to present-day needs.

Of all the addresses delivered at the late Congregational Council, the one which aroused the highest enthusiasm was that of Dr. Forsyth on the gospel of the atonement. The presentation of so-called live subjects and the up-to-date sneers at the old doctrines of sin did not stir rationalistic Boston so profoundly as did the telling of the old story of the incarnation and the atonement. That address, which was out of harmony with much that had been said before, formed the climax of the convention. To it was given "Amens" and applause such as no other address called forth, and it roused the audience from their seats to sing, "In the Cross of Christ I Glory." It furnished striking evidence of the fact that what the heart longs for is the old gospel, and the old gospel is the gospel for the times.

Truth is truth forever and it is to be presented as it is in Christ, who is eternally the same. Sin is essentially the same in every age, and its consequences are the same, but it changes its forms and becomes necessary to apply the truth to changed moral conditions. So it is the duty of the pulpit to study the attitude of Christ towards present day problems, and declare the will of Christ to this generation in such manner as will meet the peculiar needs of the age.

The pulpit of to-day must not ignore the demands justly made upon it for support in proper movements for the relief of

the suffering and oppressed. It must not speak in a half-hearted, apologetic sort of a way of Sunday rest, of child labor and women labor. The active support of the clergy must be enlisted in the work of investigating and lessening the evils of such abominations as the sweating system and the saloon. Wise and proper movements in the interest of social and political reform deserve from us something more than listless well-wishing.

The words of Joseph Parker recently uttered have the right ring: "I am wearied with your milk and water man. I want the preacher whether he be popular or unpopular to be fearless, independent, gracious, inflexible in justice. You may stone him, but God will nourish his soul."

The courageous presentation of the truth fails not to give timely warning against such insidious beginnings of criminality and disgrace as gambling and drinking in the home, seemingly so harmless when spoken of as "progressive euchre" and the "social glass." Sometimes it becomes necessary in seeking to save the people from vice to warn the young against the practice of secret self-debasing habits and to speak plainly of the dreadful sin of murdering unborn infants—a sin, according to the testimony of physicians, alarmingly prevalent in the married state.

The pulpit moving up to the front and leading the forces in the onward march against evils which endanger the purity and perpetuity of the family and the state, assures truest and highest success in the work of the Church. To halt when others advance, to be timid and dilatory and vacillating or to be subservient to money power or political expediences makes the pulpit a poor teacher in wise and just social reforms.

The fearlessness of an Ezra, a Daniel, a Luther, a Whitefield is contageous and such heroic courage in the preacher serves to make men in the pew resolute, iron-hearted in support and defense of the right.

The fearlessness, the courage and the patience of the ministry of to-day give promise of improvement in the pew. The work of God's ambassadors will be fruitful. We may not be disheartened by the evils of the present. The forces are in line for their extermination. If the darkness seem blacker than ever, it

may be because the revealing light is beginning to shine more gloriously.

The voice of history gives us cheer. The backward glance brings courage. The Church must hear the words, "Thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God led thee."

What faith has done faith can do again. Fiercer battles have been fought in the past than we are fighting to-day. Stronger forces were met. In Reformation times a powerful and corrupt heirarchy was the foe. The very institution which God had ordained for the enlightening and saving of men became the means whereby they were kept in darkness. A few men of faith faced this form of evil and gained the victory. If they were victors in a great conflict, compared with which our contests are mere skirmishes, we have no reason to despond.

ARTICLE III.

"THE POWER OF HIS RESURRECTION."

By Prof. W. H. Wynn, Ph. D., D. D.

It is related of our Lord, that his last words on earth were an assumption of universal authority or power, that is, dominion over all the physical and moral forces that anywhere are, or were ordained to be—all power in heaven and on earth. These are the last words, and the first words—the last words of the incarnate ministry; the first words of the glorified One, going forth to a universal spiritual ministry among the worlds, which he had made. We catch in this way their infinite scope. How incommensurably vast the realm over which he reigns, taking in the whole dual order of things, the physical universe lying below, and the infinitely larger spiritual universe incumbent from above—the sky, into which at that moment he seemed to withdraw, the myriad worlds that roll on forever there; and that vaster realm of souls, which the wildest ranges of our material immensities cannot reach—the evanishing figure, there on the Galilean mount, is over it all.

The assumption is the more wonderful, because of the point

of time in which it was made. The crucifixion and the sepulchre have come in between. A little while ago he was in the hands of the mob. They had arrested him, and had him bound. They made him bow to the lash; they nailed him, hands and feet, to the cruel cross, and scoffing men came and looked upon his silent body, and said he was dead. They put that body in the heart of the hills and sealed it, a rumor having been whispered abroad, that the dead man had talked freely of his power over death, and had declared, if killed, he would come to life again. The strongest testimony goes to prove, that he made good his promise. In the history of evidence there is nothing so conclusive. The multitude before that open sepulchre, the whole city crowding on that memorable morning into the garden of Joseph, gaping, curious, defeated, asking how the seals could have been disturbed; what the guards could have been doing; who could have rolled that massive stone away—over all these, and over the powers of darkness, the empty sepulchre shouts defiance, to which comes in the testimony of hundreds of eye-witnesses, who afterwards saw him alive. Great jurists, who are accustomed to weighing evidence, concede that no historical event, near or remote, has been so incontestably sustained as the fact that Jesus rose from the dead.

And yet, somehow, while dwelling most profoundly on this subject, we are driven to feel that the strongest proof of this stupendous event does not lie in the testimony of eye-witnesses. Out of our devotional habits, it may be, or the necessities of our spiritual experience—for some reason, we are compelled to think that court processes, the laws of evidence, juridical standards, applied to the life, history, and religion of Jesus, are somehow harsh and incompatible, out of character with the vastness of the event—somewhat as when Pilate undertook to look at Jesus in the light of Roman law. The silent man there, with cords around his wrists, travel-stained and weary from long, sleepless, night-watches under the temple guards, has something in him, perceptible in his bearing, or else falling in a strange light from his countenance, that outshines all the majesty of the Roman

law, and that Pilate recognizes as beyond the reach of all the legal standards he knew. Do you want evidence, such as the courts require to substantiate any matter of fact, putting men on the witness-stand, and, without collusion and without bias, getting their testimony as to what they say and heard?—you can have an abundance of this, going to show that Jesus was seen many times after his resurrection from the grave.

But for a fact of this kind we instinctively press for stronger evidence than human jurisprudence can take note of, a higher species of attestation than is known in human courts. If there is difficulty in stating what this is, it is because the religious consciousness has a logic of its own, asserting itself in emotional prompting, even where its canons are not accepted as authoritative law. That it was, that wrought so powerfully on Pilate, and on Pilate's wife. A kind of testimony slipt into the ears of the Procurator, that did not want to be articulated in words, but which silently and swiftly rebutted all the loud-mouthed scandal the riotous court of the Jews were shouting out against him. Nearer to the law than the mob, no doubt, a Roman official would be likely to have a sense of responsibility which the mob had not. But, evidently, the Nazarene was a kind of prisoner that Pilate had never before seen. Fettered he was, disheveled from abuse, his visage marred, and manifestly in the hands of the temple police, there was yet something about him that Pilate had never before witnessed in mortal man, a majesty, a subdued grandeur of personality, that threw the great diplomat off his guard, and which legend says haunted him to the bitter end. Pilate's wife also saw this same thing in her dreams—dreams, where shadows, often, are more authoritative than bristling lictors around a curule chair.

Now what was that? Our answer must involve some of the subtlest experiences of human life. We know of two ways of judging men, the neighbors with whom we associate, the men and women who walk with us, and mingle with us, along the paths of social and business life—two ways: superficially, when we confine our estimate to matters of fact; profoundly, when we have them as our friends.

On the witness stand, giving in testimony as to a man's character, we should be confined to matters of fact. Opinion, rumor, the testimony of feeling as to what a man is, would be ruled out of court, Feeling might be prejudice; opinion the mere whim of a friendly bias. But when we have taken a man into our heart of hearts, into our sympathy, our love, we know him by a kind of self-manifestation, that goes far beyond the measurement of mere out-door facts. Men wear masks when out-of-doors—the real self never coming fully into view in the whirl of many motives, and many conflicting interests, sweeping through the streets. In business, all day long, or casually meeting one another with a passing salute, it is always with the visor down, and shielding our privileged privacy under a swift disguise. The real man appears only in his home, sitting by the fire-side with wife and children, and under the glowing altars of the household gods. If you want to know who your closest business companion really is, you must contrive, somehow, to observe him unobserved in the retiracy of his home. The moment he meets you at the door, both for him and for you, the instinctive habit of masquerading is resumed, and the outside self is put on. If, however, he will make you a member of his household, he and you together will throw off your outside disguises, and your deepest personality will have full play.

Poor, indeed, would be our knowledge of Christ, and fallacious, also, if we had to approach him simply through the avenue of outside fact—let that fact be stupendous and marvelous in the highest degree. Here is one who consents to have himself swept by violence into the realms of the dead. What for? Evidently to demonstrate that he has all the subtle forces of life under his control; who houses with corruption, for a brief space, that he may bring back from it, as developed out of it, a new organism, in which infinite measures of spiritual worth and potency may reside—his feet just leaving the heights of Galilee, apparently for a tour of the universe, and in his farewell words fixing his rank as the equal of God, claiming all power, all authority, absolute deific incumbency over all things—to one wanting evidence of all this, demanding an ar-

ray of argument that shall compel his belief, what shall we say?

Well, what are the implications, in the first place—what presupposed condition in the one asserting such a rank, would be necessary to make our acquiescence easy, and lead us on to say: "Yes, this thing being so, that other comes after as a matter of course"? Here is one, who having been clearly dead, is discovered alive—has conquered death. Then, of necessity, he must have power over life and death. But there are deeper involutions of our thought. The dead man is not only alive, but pervasively alive, that is to say, immanent, in all things living and dead—not on the heights of Galilee only, nor in the depths of immensity into which he plunged, but everywhere, in the air that we are this moment breathing, in all the physical, and mental, and spiritual forces that are at work here, and in all places of his dominion—the historically outside figure in Galilee, being the spiritually inside, all-pervasive, energy of the world. The fact of the resurrection, if it be granted, takes all this vast matter into its logical embrace. But are we satisfied? Has the power of the resurrection, thereby, opened its full glory upon our mind?

We speak all too familiarly of the power of the resurrection, and are fond of adverting to the fact, that those favored men who witnessed it, went forth into the world with almost that solitary theme on their lips. Glad news with those primitive preachers was quite comprehensivelv the "resurrection" and thereby the "life." They went saying: We saw him crucified. Some of our company were present at his embalming. The highest authorities of the state made sure of his death, and were at pains to have him securely imprisoned in a tomb—after all which we saw him alive, and talked with him, and walked with him, and held sweet converse with him, at divers times, for the space of forty days. Enthusiasm over a fact of that kind for an eye-witness, might very well transcend all bounds, for what tremendous problems are once and forever solved by it, unquestionably for him who witnessed it, and ultimately for all those who receive without bias the story he tells.

But you and I, coming on the stage nearly two thousand years after the event, cannot have our enthusiasm kindled to an equal pitch. We may, indeed, accept most cordially, and even gladly, the testimony of Peter and John, and the rest, as to the fact of the resurrection, and by letting our historic imagination play warmly over the event, come into some sort of outdoor realization of the "power of resurrection." Reading about it, with all the stores of richest scholarship in the investigation; weighing evidence after the most rigid methods of the procedure of the courts—all this will but bring the towering figure to our doorstep, or, at best, into a knocking attitude before the door.

Just here we face the element of *domesticity*, or devout *privacy*, in the religion of Jesus, a mystical element, of which the learned critics can take no note. Before it, all outside methods and formulæ are impotent and inept. Only the analogy of a very familiar experience, will throw light on that act of the soul—fundamental and essential to discipleship, always—in which it apprehends, spiritually, the full deific implications of the resurrection event—an event we cannot be satisfied to look at only adown the ever-fading and ever-chilling perspective of history. Human personality, we know, will never throw open its doors to another except in the privacy of home, round the hearth-stone, where men live together, and let their inmost purposes and experiences have free course. If this is true of finite personality, of the men and women whom we really know on earth, how much more so must it be of that infinite personality, which drew itself from the sepulchre, with all the attributes of the godhead clinging to its robes. Out there, on the arena of history, this personality drawing itself from the sepulchre, and then on a high mountain, in spectacular splendor, visibly expanding itself to take in immensity and infinity, and from having been imprisoned in time and space, come to be the recognized source of all that, with all the worlds nestling in his embrace—a fact, or an assumption like this, on the bare floor of history, may very well be compassed about by dissentient inquiries and insinuations of doubt. What was it all for—this

going down into the grave and coming up again—this transformation of a martyred preacher into a glorified God? Did he not leave our earth, where for a few hallowed years his path was strewn with wonders, and where, evidently, he had it in his power to stay, and, staying, would have blessed us forever? Did he not ascend up on high, and sit down at the right hand of God the Father, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead? Does not the creed itself confine the whole vast panorama of the resurrection to the superficies of an historical canvass, ignoring, in this way, the one fundamental, the element of privacy, upon which our foregone conclusions have been so sanguinely based? There it is. He ascended into heaven—going up literally upon a pavilion of cloud—away from our earth, in actual extradition to a localized habitation in the deepest recesses of the home of God—staying there, until the rolling cycles shall call him forth again, to dispense judgment in a final assize.

Now I protest, this Risen Jesus shall not leave the mankind into whose bosom he descended. It must not be so. I cannot make the far journey through the dim and untraversable immensities to find him, in his solitary seat fast by the right hand of God—after his having been so near to us, and once on the very threshold of our homes. This matter has been too literally conceived, and in face of it, we must be reminded, over and over again, of the Apostolic canon of interpretation, "the letter killeth, it is the Spirit that giveth life." Going up from the heights of Galilee, fading off in the illimitable sky, finally regaining his great white throne left vacant through the brief years of his incarnate humiliation—thence to send out a delegated agency on Pentecostal visitations to bereaved assemblies, praying and forlorn—there must be some misconception in this matter, since "up" and "down" are illusory terms with reference to the eternal world. Possibly we have fallen into the error—a very common one, indeed,—of making a metaphor stand for a literal fact. The eternal world best speaks to our dull conceptions, by the inarticulate language of symbol, letting in light, as we are able to receive it, from behind the shifting obscurations

of figures of speech. And so it is well to suspect some such accommodation, when the risen Jesus is made to ascend from our planet to the "right hand of God," that being only a metaphorical ascription of omnipresent power to him who, a little while ago, seemed to be weaker than any child, and had been laid away as a dead man in a tomb—rather than a literal description of a localized abode for the glorfied Son of Man, far, far away, from the little group he has left as orphans in the world. Luther's intuition was never profounder, than in his famous saying: "The right hand of God is everywhere."

Putting all this together, we are driven to the conclusion, that Jesus went up into his resurrection habit, not that he might be absent, but that he might be present, supplementing his historical visitation to the streets of our cities, with his resurrection indwelling in the very homes of our souls. Long time ago, and now in the historical aspects of his coming, my beloved was knocking at the door, possibly with long pleading, and against the luxurious ease that had wrapt me around, as I had composed myself to pleasant dreams—'knocking, until his head was filled with dew, and his locks with the drops of the night, even putting in his hand by the latch of the door, and making the handles thereof to distill with the odor of myrrh, of sweet-smelling myrrh through all the room—but, at my leisurely opening for him, he was gone. Happy were I, if in this dilemma, I shall go crying after him through the streets of the city, and having found him, I should hold him, and not let him go, until I had brought him into my mother's house.' This sweet spiritual love-idyl, we notice, has its culmination of joy only when the rejected beloved is brought back in triumph to the mother's house. We know the Risen One only when he lives with us, and yields the potency of his resurrection in familiar converse and counsel round the hearth-stone of the soul.

Happily he gave to his disciples, and to us, the key to his resurrection, before he descended into the shadows whence his glorified figure was to emerge. He was going away that he might come again, in such shape as that the narrow environment of his fleshy limitation might be outstript—going so far

as to say, that, whereas now he was simply *with* them, in outside, more or less distant association, then he should be *in* them, a companion God for them in all their ways. Disappearing from the outward eye, he would flash in upon the inward eye, wherever the vision of the soul was searching enough to find him out. The Paraclete, beyond all question, was his way of naming his higher self, with glorified endowment, ubiquity clinging to his wingless robes. Manifestly he made that promise good—demonstrating it, in a brief consummating resurrection history, which is really the world's priceless evangel of peace. Appearing to Mary first, in the quiet glow of that first Easter morning, we notice that he refuses to be touched, because, doubtless, the gross contact would be disappointed in meeting no resistance in the intangible form—which form easily rises and floats over the garden, and is here and there, in mountain, sea, and city, at his option. and passes unobstructed through closely-barred doors. His tutelage is cautious and patronizing, for was he not stooping to men of very simple minds? They might think him a ghost, and through superstitious terror failed to identify their risen Lord. He has gradually prepared them for this preëminent crisis, by temporary outflashings, so to speak, of this same glorified self upon their dazzled sense, in the Transfiguration, for example, or when he walked at night on the troubled sea. At such strange sight they were paralyzed with fear. Fear repels, and yet this august dazzling one must, somehow, become the familiar home confidant of the soul. Oh, how the dull faith of these people was sorely tried on the matter of God—now he was too much man, then he was too mueh spirit, to satisfy their groping inquiries after the infinite God—reminding us of the petty troubling we are wont to be at, respecting this same great matter, asking if, after all, this story of the Risen One might not be a highly embellished, intensely colored, reproduction of the inveterate ghost-myth, that haunts the religious musings of all the world.

Against all this, we must emphasize the divine ingenuity of the narrative, which at once puts the question of myth, utterly and forever, outside the pale of gospel mystery—since it would

present the impossible predicament of myth refining on itself. This man with miracle in his fingers, suffers himself to be killed by riotous masses, whom he could have paralyzed in the attitude of inflicting the blow. There can be no God in him. Again, the grave is empty, it is true, and the floating figure seems to have made itself apparent on the highway, and along the seashore, and to have come in even here to our closeted assembly, through these tightly-barred doors. He is a ghost and not a god. But observe here the ingenious rebuke of both delusions in the one pathetically condescending test. That I am not a ghost, you may demonstrate by putting your fingers into the prints in my palms, and thrusting your hands into the spear gash in my side. That I am the same man whom you saw laid away in the tomb, and not another, you can palpably attest for yourselves in the same way—nay, rather than that the identification should in the least particular fail, I will share with you the broiled fish you have with you for lunch. Superstition and scepticism, running both ways, the Risen One promptly meets, and never in the history of legend or myth was there so facile an adaptation of means to an end. It is as if he had said, I have come all along this path of incarnate wonder, to be present at the issues of this very hour—suffering that I might enter into my glory—and now this glory, living in the deific proportions of my risen body, I must set securely in the eyes of men, so that a conviction of it may never die out of the world—so that it will be no unreasonable solace, when I promise my disciples to be more intimately with them henceforward, than I was, when toiling and suffering with them in the flesh. "Lo, I am with you always"—that shall be the key to my resurrection glory, for these mourning comrades of mine, and for all those who, through them, shall believe on my name—down "even to the consummation of the age," or to that unhappy era, if it must come, when men will challenge my theanthropic ministry. and prate learnedly of a metaphysical God.

We come, then, to our Lord's own distinctive doctrine, of his personal indwelling with those who have caught sight of his glorified figure, in the resurrection, and have taken his vitaliz-

ing words into transforming efficacy upon their hearts and lives. To all such the Risen One is their God—the plenary satisfaction of every Godward aspiration that may spring up in their hearts. "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them * * * I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him"—in short, be his God. It behoves us, however, to consider well the scope of this doctrine, lest our interest in it be only half-hearted, taking it as the soldiers cast lots on the seamless garments of the crucified one, there underneath the awful tragedy of the cross. This doctrine must be all to us, or nothing. We must set it down as the essence of the gospel, as we get the meaning of the drama at that point of its evolution, where all the threads of conflicting interest run together and converge. The resurrection sums up everything else in the person and work of our Lord. The world had come to that stage in its history, when it must have the interposition of a divine-human God. The glorified Jesus was that God. He fills the whole disk of the eye of faith. He looms alone on the horizon of the religious consciousness, as in John's vision of an angel standing in the sun—the sun of righteousness rising with healing in his wings—and to that kind of sun-worship all the world is henceforth invited to come. He is the condensed ritual, also, for all spiritual worship that actually and directly lifts the yearning soul up to its God; for, when cleansing the Temple at Jerusalem of its mercenary desecration, did he not give it as his authority, that the temple of his body was greater than it, and that when the apostate temple had done its worst on the incarnate temple, tearing it down with vandal hands, he would build it up again in three days.?

To be brief about it, you cannot call the Risen One God, except in tacit admission of his absolute right. God! O, the immeasurable sweep and vastness of the word! Applying it to Jesus, even when he has emerged from the sepulchre, and has manifestly sloughed off the larger burden of his incarnate limitations in the flesh, may involve an harrassing paralogism against which the logical intellect of man may beat and bleed in vain. The infinite God has no limits—shrinks even from the

deftest touch of any logical predicate, and the theologians and philosophers, therefore, have agreed to consign the whole conception over to the vague and formless inane of spirit—to rest it there—not dreaming, that it is really the realm of agnosticism to which they have arrived. The shining One, on the heights of Olivet, has manifestly come into large measures of spiritual enfranchisement—mounting with the cherubim, and having "under his feet as it were a paved work of sapphire stone, and as it were the very heaven for clearness"—but to be absolute, the glorified body must transcend all limits, its contour, if we may so speak, must dissolve away into the shadowless mist of the infinite itself. If this be the logical dilemma in conceiving of God, then, of course, we greatly erred in ascribing diefic proportions to the risen body of the crucified Nazarene. Moreover it is essential to our idea of God, that he be immanent in all things,—not measurably pervasive—not at all ever going from place to place—transfusing rather the utmost bounds of immensity, and holding his undiminished fullness inside and outside the universe of worlds. But this Risen figure goes from place to place, soaring or flashing, let us say, and at last seeming to rise in the heavens, as if on an aerial voyage to some celestial port—but all the while held fast, it would seem, by the inveterate clinging of time and space. When I call God immanent, I experience no incongruity, or violence done to my thought, for is not God a spirit, and does not that word suggest an expanse of being lying formless and fadeless on the whole sum of things, compassing creation round, as the sky embosoms the revolving worlds? I call God immanent—is Jesus immanent? He must, indeed, be so, if he is God. Happily there is no greater violence done to the thought, in conceiving the risen body of Jesus so expanding beyond all space limits, as to be endowed with ubiquity, than there is in suffering the idea to drop off into the abyss of a substanceless inane. The alternative seems to be between a living God, and the metaphysical divinity of clouds and darknesss on an infinite sea.

I am admonished, that in thus emphasizing the resurrection, I am but reviving a species of anthropomorphism, with which

Christian apologetics has successfully struggled long ago. In the Clementine homilies, in Tertullian, in the more elevated and refined thinking of Lactantius, this problem was essayed, the necessity of conceiving God only as he is revealed in the person of Christ. There was some grossness no doubt, some subtle blight of materialism, in their way of setting forth their ideas of what is clearly the unique quality in the religion of Jesus—that the glorified figure of the Risen One must fill up for us the whole measure of our finite capacity for God. It is not surprising, that the Alexandrian theologians should not have taken to these views. Among them Greek philosophy prevailed, running inevitably into the besetting fallacy of all philosophy, that God can be only negatively known—known as to what he is not, and not as to what he is—that is to say, not known at all. The simple-minded in those days, to whom no great philosophy came with its pegeantry of cloud, were wiser than they. Out from Alexandria, in the year 399, in the Scetic desert, there was a band of monks, who were charged with holding anthropomorphic, and, therefore, unspiritual ideas of God, in the way they put the image of Jesus in the niche, where the Bishop of Alexandria said God ought to be. They had no Greek philosophy in their unstudious ranks, but the venerable and saintly Serapion was their prophet and their priest. He was deeply read in the story of Jesus, and the power of the resurrection had passed into his soul. The learned Bishop, Theophilus, thought he must make all haste, to recover those deluded people from the deadly heresy into which they had fallen—not knowing that it was a simple case of "out of the mouth of babes hath he ordained praise." Groups of scholars were commissioned to labor with Serapion in his desert retreat. He was shown that he was an *anthropomorphite*, underneath which large and sonorous accusation there was slumbering a swift ecclesiastical curse. By persuasion and intimidation, they brought the old man to think he was convinced. In the joy of their success, they would all kneel down together, and thank God for the enlightenment he had poured into these simple

minds. Almost we can hear the dry whining of those sacerdotal and Christless prayers. Meantime, while these prayers were going on—the spirit of Serapion was being tossed and buffetted on a tempestuous sea. He had tried to pray, in the new style, after the manner of the Alexandrian wise ones, who were entrusted with the secrets of God. The eye of his faith had roamed immensity, and had found no object on which it could fix. When it was all over, on rising to his feet, the old man cried out—just as we should have cried out—"Poor wretch that I am! They have taken away my God; on whom shall I now depend; to whom shall I pray?" Brave Serapion! he had recanted under duress, and in the moment of his peril, the power of the resurrection had come to his release. The truth is, as Goethe was wont to reiterate, "Man never knows how anthropomorphic he is." That heavy cacophonous title describes an inalienable limitation of the human mind—the same that made mythology inevitable in the cruder stages of the religious history of the race—the same that, from the foundation of the world, prepared the Incarnation, as the consummate cultus of generations educated to approach the one God in spirit and in truth.

Finally, it is a curious and instructive fact that this essential Christian mysticism, for reasons, doubtless, deeply imbedded in the religious history of mankind, had to hang on the outermost rim of the consciousness of Christendom, and never get boldly asserted in the formulas of the creeds. The priceless jewel has been carried down the ages in an unseemly casket, possibly that it might escape the swinish desecration of quarreling sectaries, levying tribute, even, on the Ark of the Lord, and pouring libations from consecrated vessels to gods of gold. It must, therefore, be kept in the inviolable privacy of that Holy of Holies of every devout soul of man, where the Risen One will come to dwell, if, indeed, he can find the sweet heavens within us rolling back their doors, and shouting him in with hymns of praise. All down the ages, the shrinking mystics have conserved this gospel of the resurrection, while the scholastics were harrying the outside world with their pedantic clamor, and grind-

ing up their puerile dogmas into logical dust. From Francis to Luther the stream flowed on, often through long stretches of fanatical dreamland, it it true, and many leagues of theosophical mist. It was a stream of esoteric, unformulated, subconscious sentiment, for the most part, concealed under the gloom of monkish austerities, or rushing to the surface over the sterile wastes of sacramental strife. But always the cry was, the sigh was, for the *mystica unio*—how shall the whole space of my inner experience be cleared, and given over to the coming of the glorified Son of Man, as the rightful God entering into possession of his own?

In tracing this current, therefore, we must enter the history of dogma through a postern door. Who was Eckhart, for example, and the *Brethren of the Free Spirit*, who took up with his method of replacing the usurping individuality of man, with the eternal Word of God, born in the soul? Much subtlety there was, and much needless Neo-Platonic soaring into the thin air of transcendental heights—forestalling Hegel in those terrifying ghostly abstractions of "Nicht" and "Ich"—yet fixing on the fundamental requirement of the complete renunciation of self, to give room for the advent of the Divine-Human God. "When I am in this state"—the absolute quietism which his way of thinking recommended—"God brings forth his Son in me." A mistake it was, for the Master himself had plainly conditioned his indwelling on having his commandments and keeping them, therefore on an active ethical rather than a quiescent, renunciation of self. Then came the *Friends of God*, keeping up, even more ardently, the resolute purpose to attain to a living intercourse with the glorified Son of Man, by the renunciation of self—imitating the Master in this exercise, if peradventure the precise nature of that exercise could be ascertained. But here they ran out into two schools. Self must be renounced to give room for God in Christ, but Christ himself, in the days of his humiliation, taught us how to renounce. Tauler, of the *Friends of God*, almost with prophetic inspiration, set his pupils Suso and Ruysbrœck on the way of finding out and copying the renunciation of our Lord—the one discover-

ing it, as he thought, in our Lord's passion; therefore, it would be by suffering that the usurping self would be got out of the way—the other, Ruysbrœck, finding it in the Incarnation, thought that the incarnate life of our Lord might be installed in the soul by contemplation, or devout quietism, the self giving way by mental abnegation to the absorbing advent of the Incarnate life. Ruysbrœck taught Groot, and Groot taught Thomas á Kempis, and Thomas threw together the devout Residuum of all schools in that marvelous book, the *Imitation of Christ*, "which has been translated into more languages than any other book save the Bible, and which has moved the hearts of so many men of all nations, characters, and conditions of life."

If, however, we would see to what extent this tacit, shrinking mysticism, the unformulated power of the resurrection, contributed to the revolutionary enthusiasm of the Religious Reformation of the 16th century—a mysticism essentially ascetic, and not even constructive in its habit—we must be familiar with the earlier stages of Luther's development, a subject we cannot enter upon here. Suffice it to say, that the *Friends of God* brought into the monk's cell two determining influences, which gave type to Luther's theology, in so far as the rush of his reformatory zeal would admit of propositional restraint. Through Staupitz, Tauler's sermons were put in his hands, still regarded as among the noblest the German language has produced. How deeply read he was in these, his life-long preaching and writing abundantly attest. Indeed, it is not too much to say, that the very tissue of his experience was fashioned thereby, and in a sense not over-concessionary it may be said, that as to the deeper spiritual incitements of Luther's tremendous undertaking, this man Tauler stood nearer to him than all the contemporary University Doctors with whom he was wont to consult. The Fathers he repudiated, scholasticism and Aristotelianism were a horror to him, and in the gush of his ardor he more than once set theology itself aside, but never did he forget his indebtedness to Tauler, and certainly never dropt from his thinking the fundamental conceptions of the *Friends of God*. Again, some anonymous member of that body pro-

duced that remarkable book, the *Deutsche Theologie*, called with great propriety "the handbook of mystical devotion" through all these years. Luther pored over the pages of that book. He drank deep into its spirit. He published an edition of it, with a commendatory preface, saying that next to the Bible and St. Augustine, this book appealed to the deepest religious yearnings of his soul. It stood on the same pedestal with the great Tauler—"the subject matter of this little book is in the style of the enlightened Doctor Tauler"—in his preface—and then to Spalatin; "I send you herewith, as it were, an epitome of all the writings of Tauler." In Tauler, he avowed, he found more genuine and sound theology than in all the scholastic theologians and universities of the world. Had not Luther's Ninety-Five Theses, nailed to the door of the Wittenberg church, preceded his edition of the "German Theology" of 1518, we might memorialize the publishing of that "little book," as the first bugle note of the Reformation, sounded down the ages, and echoing distinctly to this day. For out of it came Luther's high view of the Person of Christ, from which he never receded, notwithstanding he unwarily let it down into the wild whirlpool of sacramental disputation, and saw it submerged, for a time at least, in the voluminous sweep of Puritanic agitation all over the world. Through it all, Luther held on to the *mystica unio*, impressing it upon Protestantism at large, even where the creeds have refused it articulate recognition, and upon all theologians in lineal descent from him, as a Christo-centric legacy which they may very well boast of as beyond all calculable price. These words of Luther—let them stand for the right hand of his religious thinking, his Augustinianism being his left; "Christ, I say, not as some in blind language declare, giving us righteousness and himself remaining without; for righteousness is dead—rather, it is never given at all—unless Christ himself is also present, just as there can be no rays of the sun, nor warmth of fire, where there is neither sun nor fire." There it all is, the Risen One, the glorified Son of Man immanent in the Soul.

One word of appealing exortation to all Christian people

may not be out of place, as bearing upon the peculiar difficulties the religion of the resurrection is compelled to face in the age in which we live. Now, as the issue is plainly made up, a life and death struggle between agnosticism and the Incarnation, might not all the forces of Christendom drop their differences, smother their hates, pull down all partition walls, erase old-time jealousies, extinguish alien fires on their altars, and rally to this one point—especially as when thus mobilized, they will find the power of the resurrection coming, in that very act, to its own support.

ARTICLE IV.

MELANCHTHON'S DOCTRINE OF THE WILL.

By Rev. Julius F. Seebach, A. M.

"A honied flower from blackest earth,*
The crown of fame and praises worth,
Lies withered here in quiet rest,
By the fierce heat of life opprest.
The grateful bees have carried home
Honey from thence, to fill their comb;
Many a spider crept along it,
Many a poisonous worm has stung it;
Yet scathless, in this shrine it lies;
Its work is such as never dies."

So sang old Johann Mathesius in his elegy to the memory of Philip Melanchthon. It was a truthful summary of a fruitful but troubled life. For many years he wrought at the task God had set him, doing a work that none other in his time could do. They were years when thousands of eager students gathered from all parts of Europe to drink in the sweetness of his wisdom; they were years when enemies arose, and envy, like a serpent's trail, was seen across the path of his devout advance. He died; and psalms of thanksgiving were raised by more than one; but, in the absence of the body, even his enemies came to

*Μέλ'-ἀνθος Μέλαν-Χθών.

recognize the greatness of the spirit that once had moved in visible form among them.

What is thus true in general of Melanchthon's life is true in particular with reference to his conception and development of the doctrine of the will. No teaching of his was during his life less understood, or more severely attacked. Friends and foes alike caricatured it, and either in opposition or in advocacy carried the thought to extremes which were dangerous to the symmetry of truth. But the doctrine received its best vindication in the fact that his bitterest enemies were later forced to adopt it, in the form he had given it, as the expression of a necessary truth.

The doctrine of the will, however, had not always the same form and content in Melanchthon's mind. A study of his *Loci* and commentaries reveals three fairly well defined phases of thought. They may be designated as absolute predestination, moderate Augustinism, and synergism (so-called); and they follow thus chronologically in Melanchthon's development of the doctrine.

This order was inevitable under the circumstances. Determinism was psychologically necessary in opposition to the pretentious claims of scholastic philosophy for human powers. The papal theologians, in the interest of their system of doctrine, had over-exalted human powers and freedom in their relation to divine actions. Like begets like, even in opposition; and so the one extreme of a will entirely free was met by another extreme of will enslaved. Luthardt, with keen insight, has observed in this connection: "It is the universal law of historical development that the new, next only to its novelty, is conscious of its opposition to the old, and keeps itself entirely opposed to that; until, after it has won an assured stability, it seeks again the torn threads of union with the old. The adjustment then becomes an inner necessity and a morally ordered function."*

This is the order of development which we shall find in the thought of Melanchthon as we proceed. It is to his great

*Die Lehre vom freien Willen, sec. 7, p. 150.

honor that he went on from the beginnings of Christ in the Reformation to approximate the perfection that the limits of a lifetime could attain. Others there were who did not dare to face the truth with all its consequence as he did; to-day they lie embalmed in their own orthodoxy, while his spirit lives triumphant despite the cries of heresy.

And yet it is what we might have expected of Melanchthon. He was a scholar before he was a reformer; a humanist before he became a theologian; a searcher for truth rather than a framer of dogmas. There is apparent in all his thought—aside from his very first expression of it— the open-mindedness which passes no irrevocable judgment on anything that is subject to human conceptions. There is manifest, too, the culture that discovered in the world's experiences the high dignity of humanity, and has realized that the true glory of the Creator exists in the exaltation, rather than in the debasement, of his highest creatures.

This will be seen as the thought of Melanchthon is presented in the order of its development. But there is one consideration to be kept in view, in order that he may not be misunderstood. It is the practical religious standpoint from which all his observations are taken. The ethical element is predominant. What would be incorrect in his writings, were he appealing solely to the intellect, and establishing simply a system of dogmatics, becomes truth of no mean importance when we remember that he is writing from the standpoint of human action. We may wish at times that he had traced every question to its logical conclusion. But that he did not do, for reasons which we shall appreciate later on; and then, perhaps, we shall be glad he did not.

FIRST PERIOD—1519–1525.

ABSOLUTE PREDESTINATION.

In the beginning, Melanchthon's doctrine of the will was nothing more than Luther's conception put into logical form. The reason for this is not hard to find. He was Luther's disciple, adopting his position and re-stating it in a manner consistent with his own scholarly spirit. If his presentation sounds

harsh and stern as compared with Luther's it is because of the greater intellectual factor, which reveals the logical consequences of such a position. But just because his argument was more strictly logical, says Luthardt, "so much more easily could the fallacy of the premises be perceived and overcome."*

Nor yet was this extreme position his own or Luther's alone; it was characteristic of the Reformation period. In Dorner's words: "It is well known that in every age in which the splendor and freshness of Christianity rose before mankind with new clearness, there is to be observed the most powerful emphasizing of absolute dependence upon God, and a return particularly to the Pauline exhibition of doctrine."† The Reformers, like the great apostle, had a highly developed system of work-righteousness to combat.

"There are two parts of man," says Melanchthon "the power of knowing, the power from which the feelings arise."‡ Of these, knowledge is subordinate, and "serves will," so that "they call by the new name of free will, will joined with knowledge."§ "Law pertains to the power of knowing; * * * to the power of the feelings, virtue, vice."|| Therefore "liberty cannot properly be said to fall in the category of knowledge,"¶ because it is subject to the will. What then is liberty? "To be able to do or not to do, to be able to do thus or otherwise.—Therefore it is called into question whether will is free, and how far it is free."** Thus briefly Melanchthon puts the question, and answers it immediately by an appeal to predestination: "Will in reference to predestination is not free either in good or in evil, either in external works or in internal affection."††

But this theological statement of the question is not sufficient. It does not satisfy every phase of the problem. A query concerning the moral, spiritual freedom of human will is answered by an appeal to the relation of God to his creation;

*Die Lehre vom freien Willen, p. 149.
†History of Protestant Theology, vol. I. p. 207.
‡Corp. Ref. XXI. 13, 86.
§C. R. XXI. 13, 77.
||C. R. XXI. 13, 87.
¶C. R. XXI. 14, 87.
**C. R. XXI. 14, 87.
††C. R. XXI. 14, 87.

as far as divine foreknowledge is concerned, nothing is free. But it is asked, "Is the will of man free in his moral acts? Can he do good and evil—can he do or not do?" Melanchthon therefore follows his philosophical discussion with a psychological consideration of the nature of man. This is really the more important argument, and should have had the first place, for the burden of proof rests upon it. To have given the psychological argument first, and then to have followed it with the theological and the accompanying Scriptural proofs, would have been more forcible. Melanchthon evidently saw this, for in the editions of the *Loci* of 1522–23, he reversed the positions of the two arguments, and greatly expanded the psychological.

"We will contemplate the nature itself of human will more closely," says Melanchthon, "so that the thoughtful may detect false sophists not only in theological matters, but also in the judgment of nature."* "If you judge the power of human will by the natural understanding, it cannot be denied, according to human reason, that there is in it a certain liberty of external works."† But external works have no moral significance; and so, "because God does not regard external works, but the internal motions of the heart, Scripture has recorded nothing about that liberty."‡ It is therefore a question of the "internal motions"—whether they are free. But "the internal affections are not in our power; for we learn by experience and use that the will cannot of its own accord lay aside love, hate, or like feelings, but feeling is conquered by feeling; so that, because you have been wounded by him whom you loved, you cease to love him. For you love yourself more ardently than anyone else."§ Wherefore it follows that the will is not free in moral activity, but that feeling is subject to feeling, and all to the supreme feeling for self.

But some one may say: "How does it happen that we men often choose something different from our feeling?"‖ And the answer is, in the first place, that feeling is subject to feeling. "Alexander may love pleasure, but he loves glory more; so he

*C. R. XXI., 89. †C R. XXI., 90.
‡Ibid. §C. R. XXI, 90. ‖Ibid.

despises ease and endures hardship for the sake of glory."* In the second place, one might choose something "directly contrary to all the feelings." One might treat pleasantly him whom in his soul he hated. But this is mere appearance, an external act, a fiction of the intellect. The hate would still be hate.† Wherefore again it is proved that "the internal affections are not in our power," and that the will is subject to the rule of selfishness. "What matters it, then, to boast liberty of external works, when God requires purity of heart?"‡ "The Christian knows that nothing is less in his power than his own heart."§

It might be asked, however, whether this "love of self" might not desire the spiritual. But selfishness is the supreme feeling, and "the power from which the feelings arise is that by which we follow after or turn from that which is known."‖ Since knowledge follows only the carnal sense, this supreme feeling in man must desire only that which is carnal—for "the natural man receiveth not the the things of the Spirit of God." (1 Cor. 2 : 14). It can be clearly seen then, that this selfishness in man is of the essence of sin. The determining inclination of man is carnal, ignorant of God, sinful.¶ The constancy of Socrates, the chastity of Xenocrates, the temperance of Zeno, the philosophic morality of Plato and Cicero—all are tainted with self-seeking.** Hence the natural virtues of the heathen are only seeming virtues and real sins;†† for as the fire, according to its nature, strives upward, as the iron toward the magnet, so man follows after sin.‡‡ By such an argument as this Melanchthon proves the spiritual inability of the human will.

But there is more yet in the argument. It is a blow aimed at the scholastic contention for *meritum congrui* and *opera moralia*, by showing their impossibility.§§ To the natural man whose every act is sin, there can be no moral work, no merit, no contrition—not even a *bonum non meritorium.* And there is

*C. R. XXI., 90, 91. †C. R. XXI., 91. ‡C. R. XXI., 92.
§C. R. XXI., 93. ‖C. R. XXI., 13. ¶C. R., XXI., 114.
**C. R. XXI., 100. ††C. R. XXI., 100. ‡‡C. R. XXI., 97.
§§C. R. XXI., 110.

more yet; it is the approach to the predestinarian conclusion of the first argument. "Therefore there is not anything in our power, either internal affection or external work. * * * And all things happen as they are destined by divine counsel."*

It will be seen by the conclusion of these two arguments—the philosophical and the psychological—that the relation of free will to predestination is very intimate and important. In this first period, Melanchthon considered it the chief argument. "But I may seem absurd," he says, "who at once in the beginning of a work argue concerning the most difficult point, namely, predestination. However, what does it matter whether in the first part of the compendium, or in the last place, I treat that which belongs to all parts of our discussion?"†

Melanchthon's answer to the problem of the will is fixed in the will of God; hence he is unwilling that anyone "should be anxious about the subject of predestination, or dispute why God saves this one and damns that one, why he imputes to us what he himself has destined. For he is the Lord, he does what pleases him."‡ His summary in the *Loci* of 1521, however, shows best the extreme position he had taken. "If you refer human will to predestination, neither in external nor in internal works is there any liberty, but *all things* happen according to divine purpose. If you refer will to external works, there *seems by the judgment of nature* to be a certain liberty. If you refer will to the affections, there is plainly no liberty even by the judgment of nature."§ Even the seeming liberty of external works is after all only an appearance, for the judgment of nature itself is in bondage. And so the conclusion of the argument is absolute: There is no power in human will; there is all power in the divine.

But while the logical extreme of this argument is unequivocally set forth in the *Loci*, Melanchthon presents its practical consequences most clearly in his commentaries, especially in that upon Romans, of 1522. Here especially in his comments on the 8th and 9th chapters, he combats the scholastic notion of a special

*C. R. XXI., 15. †C. R. XXI., 89.
‡C. R. XXI., 15. §C. R. XXI., 93

and a general efficacy. All that happens, "happens according to necessity and divine determination."* Hence to say that the will is free "is a ridiculous fiction, since the will turns only whither it is driven."† There is no "permission" to sin on the part of God. His part is not passive, but active. Not only the calling of Paul is his own work, but also the adultery of David and the treachery of Judas.‡ And this rule is to be applied not only to temporal affairs;—but also to eternal destiny; for "he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth" (Rom. 9 : 18). If God is actively the author of good and evil, then all who are justified receive the gift of God, and all who are condemned are the "vessels of wrath" whom he has appointed.§ There needs to be added only the statement that the glory of God is the aim of this,‖ and we have the argument in the extreme of harsh and unfeeling presentation.

The impression made by the teaching as a whole, however, is not fully in accordance with the final deductions. Scattered through the pages of the *Loci* and the commentaries there are passages that lighten the gloom of absolute predestination. Sometimes there seems to be a virtual denial of the truth of the final argument. The "glory of God" is lost sight of, in the attempt to answer the "cry of the human." Indeed, we are made to feel that the idea of the "glory of God" has no real inner connection with the rest of the thought. He must confess at times that there is a certain liberty of external choice.¶ More than once he must admit that "it seems too unpleasant to teach that man sins of necessity," and that "it seems cruel to blame the will for its inability."** Frequently, too, he loses sight of the double activity of God, and says of those who are under condemnation that "divine will has no part in their condemnation," but that "they reap only that which their sins have merited."††

*H. 1., a. †H. 1., b. ‡H. 2., a. §H. 2., a.
‖H. 3., b. Cf. Luthardt, *Lehre vom freien Willen*, pp. 154-156.
¶C. R. XXI., 92. **C. R. XXI., 86.
††Quoted from Galle, p. 256.

Yet the significance of these statements must not be used against the scope of Melanchthon's system as a whole. The extreme conclusions were carefully considered, and intended for acceptance; but they were the outcome of logical necessity rather than the expression of his own desires. Predestination and unfree will might contain the thought of the present; the milder statements had prophetic significance for the future. Take them as we may, they afford more than a hint that Melanchthon's heart was often at war with his head.

This is shown, too, by the purpose which he discovered in predestination. In the *Lucubratiuncula* he speaks of it as a "great consoler." How he could extract "consolation" from a doctrine of such rigorous absolutism, it is hard to see, unless we consider that unconsciously his desires were supplanting his logic. The "glory of God" is forgotten as he contemplates the sublime mystery of predestination, and is assured, that "the *divine goodness* is of itself the summit and power of all things."* He has no doubt that "the necessity of predestination teaches the mercy of God in this, that certain ones are chosen independently of any merit."† He sees only the greatest impiety and misery in free will, because "we should be called away from God to ourselves."‡ And there is something almost pathetic in his words, when he says: "Far off in the future there is a time when you shall have worn off the carnal sense, so that you may know that nowhere else is there a surer consolation than that of predestination."§ It sounds as if he were strengthening himself. Though he did not recognize it as yet, Melanchthon was not at rest in his conception of free will and predestination. And we, were we to judge from *all* he has said, should be certain that the near future would witness the recast of his thought.

SECOND PERIOD—1525–1535.

MODERATE AUGUSTINISM.

The precise moment when Melanchthon became conscious of the need of remodelling his conceptions will never be known;

*C. R. XXI., 15–16. †Quoted from Galle, p. 261.
‡C. R. XXI., 15–16. §Ibid.

for a change so great "cometh not with observation." But the fact that after 1525 he refused to permit the original *Loci* to be reprinted may well allow us to adopt that year as marking the point of departure.

Some writers have seen in the controversy between Luther and Erasmus the reason for the change in Melanchthon's ideas of free will and predestination. That it would have its influence we can imagine, for Erasmus with consummate skill pointed out the untenable conclusions to which absolute predestination led. But this could have force only in connection with other experiences that had extended his horizon. Melanchthon's labors as professor of theology had brought him a fuller knowledge of the Scriptures. He could not conceal from himself that there were many statements in the Bible which were not in agreement with those he had quoted in favor of predestination. Indeed, the general impression made by Holy Writ was in opposition to that conception. Its universal warning and promises could not be brought into harmony with the particularity of election. Moreover, his ethical sense pointed out with increasing persistence the incompatibility of the authorship of sin with the holiness of God. Reason and Scripture alike demanded that God be freed from all such accusation. He could not help seeing, too, the inconsistency of referring guilt to a man whose sin had been wrought in accordance with the decree of predestination, and through the efficacy of God. To think otherwise in this respect were to impute insincerity to God in his gracious offers. And had he not seen in the school of experience how these doctrines had let in all sorts of extravagances? The vagaries of the Enthusiasts and their dire results in the revolution of 1522 had risen out of these deterministic teachings, removed as they were from moral considerations. Finally, to all this may be added the results of his studies among the early Church Fathers. He had formerly judged the ancient doctrine of the Church through the pages of Augustine. Further study had taught him that the earlier Fathers, especially the Greeks, held no such view of predestination as did Augustine. Surely these could not all be in error; and Augustine himself had in his earlier years ascribed

much to the capability of the will. With all these reasons for change claiming recognition, the modification of his original views was bound to come at last.

The first express statement of Melanchthon's changed views appeared in his commentary on Colossians, which was published in the Summer of 1527. Here, in an excursus on Col. 1 : 15 concerning free will, he takes up the questions of the authorship of sin, the liberty of the will, and the extent of its ability in self-determination.

He begins : "God governs things created, and moves them continually." But this at once introduces the question whether God is "not the author of evil, or of sins." Melanchthon appeals to Christ's words, John 8 : "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own," which proves that God is not the author of sin. He sustains all "life and motion," but the devil and the wicked misuse them. It will be seen at once that Melanchthon has withdrawn from his former position concerning the double efficacy of God. The scholastic distinction between a "general" and a "special efficacy" of God, which at first was almost scornfully rejected, is now adopted. God's continual activity in the creation and sustentation of all the powers needed by his creatures must be recognized, but in such a way as to exclude the unrighteous use of such powers on the part of man; for the Scriptures plainly teach that God cannot work evil as evil. That one can stretch out his hand is God's work; that he stretches it forth to evil is his own.

This suggests the question of free will, since God moves all creatures and yet does not move to sin. The problem must be modified, however. In this connection it is not a question of natural powers, or of our relation as creatures to God the Creator, but of spiritual powers, "whether without the Holy Spirit we are able to fear God, believe in God, love the cross, etc." To the question in this form there can be but one answer : "The natural powers of man cannot effect true fear of God, true faith toward God, and other feelings and spiritual movements"—as the Scriptures plainly teach (John 6, Rom. 8).

Nevertheless a certain liberty must be granted to the will.

It can choose food and clothing; it can govern the external members (*locomotiva*); it can even effect a "carnal and legal righteousness"—as the Scriptures say, "there is a certain righteousness of the flesh. But the explanation of this last admission grants to the natural will considerable moral ability. It can abstain "from slaughter, from theft, and * * * from another's wife." In this way it can satisfy the law to any degree whatever, and display conduct highly honorable and upright. On the other hand, two limitations to this freedom must be recognized. "In the first place (it is hindered) by the weakness of the flesh, or original sin; for there is a certain weakness of the flesh, so that evil affections often overcome all our endeavors. In the second place, the devil hinders liberty, who, because he has possession in all, often drives men to open and dreadful sins." Wherefore "reason alone is not always able to afford even legal righteousness." But such a righteousness has little value even in its own sphere; and so we are to "seek the aid of the Holy Spirit," in order that God's *special* efficacy may accomplish its full work in our hearts (See Luthardt, pp. 160 sqq.; Galle, pp. 275 sqq).

Later in the same year, but much more briefly, Melanchthon expressed the same views in the Latin sketch of the Saxon Visitation Articles which was published without his knowledge. The next year, the same articles in expanded German form were presented to the public, prefaced by a commendatory introduction by Luther. At the end of both editions the subject of free will was discussed in a general way. The treatment is very similar in form and substance to that of the commentary on Colossians; the same development, the same illustrations are used. But it is interesting to notice the reason that introduces the discussion—"Many speak in an extreme way about free will." It indicates that the reformers already experienced the necessity of combatting the results of their earlier teaching.*

In the following year, 1529, Melanchthon issued his Exposition of Romans, in which he touched very lightly upon the

*See Galle, pp. 281-284., Luthardt, pp. 159-160.

questions of free will and predestination. The same year, in his Scholia on Proverbs, he sets the question entirely aside. "Do not peer into higher things," he says, "but always consider those things which God bids you. * * * Reason offends and is deceived when it inquires * * * whether we ourselves are elected. Questions of this kind are not profitable."* His reason for this silence was not far to seek; he desired to lead men's thoughts away from speculative questions which, in the exaggerated interest they aroused, kept from view the practical considerations of religion. If his opinion on these questions were desired, it could be found in his Scholia on Colossians, of 1527.†

The Augustana of 1530 maintains the same doctrinal position as the above-mentioned Scholia and Articles. Yet there is apparent a two-fold presentation that reminds us of the first period of unrest in Melanchthon's mind. There are expressions which seem to maintain all phases of conviction between absolute predestination and synergism. For instance, Art. 18, when it says man "cannot, indeed, without the divine aid, either begin or certainly accomplish what is becoming in things relating to God," seems to concede the beginning of good to man as a possibility. But if the words are taken in connection with Melanchthon's express statements in the Apology on this point, the fallacy of such a conclusion will be seen. So, too, Articles 5 and 19 seem to teach predestination both positively and negatively, when it is said—Art. 5—'the Holy Spirit is given, who, *when and where it pleases God*, works faith in those who hear the Gospel," and in Art. 19—"the cause of sin must be sought in the depraved will of the wicked, * * which, *when destitute of the divine aid*, turns away from God." But if in connection with the latter words we recall the oft-repeated thoughts of Melanchthon, that God has no part in evil *actively*, but only *permissively*, the obscurity vanishes. Nor is the former expression to be taken in any extreme way. The emphasis must be laid on "when and where," not on "it pleases God," and so the

*Scholia on Proverbs, p. 128 b. Galle, 284, 285.

†Brief Reason for Studying Theology, C. R. VII., p. 457.

clause must be understood in an historical sense; as if "God knew beyond doubt the time and season, and appointed it with himself, when he wished to call each one."* Moreover, the absence of any article on predestination in the Confession ought to be significant in this connection.

The same uncertainty is displayed in his new Commentary on Romans of 1532, but with a greater advance toward a new position. He could no longer acknowledge the "little forest of commentaries" that had been published in his name, because of their teaching; so he took this way of setting them aside. The difference is seen in the long discussion of predestination prefixed to the 9th chapter. He does not believe that Paul had election in mind in this passage, but rather the comforting of the saints, who were oppressed because of their own weakness in comparison with unbelieving Israel. Predestination, he says, "is mentioned briefly not to propagate idle questions, but to console the pious, who it was necessary should know that on one hand is the true Church, on the other the multitude of the wicked which claims title of the Church."† If the question were to be judged from the human stand-point, the conclusion would be very depressing; but the pious are not to be disturbed, for they are "to know that the Church is neither a natural production, nor multitude, nor human wisdom, but divine election forms it out of mercy."‡ If, however, predestination or election is the subject of inquiry, let the will of God be judged from his Word. But the promises of the Word are universal; wherefore it is impious to inquire after special election.§ God has conditioned the fulfilment of his promises on faith alone,‖ so that "all are elected who believe this promise, and do not cast away this faith to the last."¶

This solution of the question, however, seems to grant to man a certain share in his own conversion. And this impression is deepened by his appeal to the Church Fathers, as against

*A. C., Art. XI., Sol. Decl., p. 56, From Luthardt, p. 166.
†Galle, p. 289.
‡Ibid.
§Cf. Galle, pp. 289–292.
‖Luthardt, p. 168.
¶Galle, p. 292.

the conception of Augustine, and to Augustine himself in his earlier writings. He says "that the mercy of God is the real cause of election, but yet that there is some cause in the receiver, so far as he does not reject the offered promise." But he adds immediately, "Neither can the promise of mercy be received, nor trust be conceived, except by the Holy Spirit moving hearts through the Word;" and so the concession of one statement is met by the restriction of another.* The latter thought, however, seems to be the one consciously adopted; for it is a frequent conception of Melanchthon's that God is *creatively* active.†

The uncertainty that marks this period of Melanchthon's activity is not unlike that which characterized the close of the first period. Conceptions seem to waver, and predict a still further change; but in the confusion it is hard to draw the line of demarcation. Galle thinks Melanchthon had already changed his position in 1527; certainly before he wrote the Augsburg Confession. Luthardt is assured that the Confession was composed under the best influences of the second period, and that Melanchthon's indecision began to appear only in the Commentary on Romans of 1532. Herrlinger will recognize neither the original absolute predestination, nor the later elements that suggest synergism. He refers all change to the developed ethical sense, and fixes the limit of the second period as late as 1552.

The difficulty is largely removed, however, if we bear in mind the spirit that animated Melanchthon at this time. He had seen on the one hand how barren of results, and how open to constant misunderstanding for the practical affairs of life, the dogmatic treatment of religion became. On the other hand, he realized the paralyzing effect of proclaiming man's passivity under the gracious operation of God. Moreover, such teaching seemed in the highest sense untrue. God's Word was not a book of magic, but an eloquent appeal to the moral sense; men were not "blocks" or "statues," but self-conscious and self-

*Galle, p. 293., Luthardt, p. 169.
†Cf. Luthardt, p. 170.

determining beings. The more he recognized this, the greater became his efforts to supply the need thus discovered.

It is a question whether Melanchthon ever abandoned his moderate view of predestination. From the stand-point of abstract thought it is unlikely that he ever departed form the conclusion expressed to Brenz in 1531: "You subtly, and apart from predestination, infer that his own place is assigned to each one, and you reason rightly."* But abstract conclusions were not the necessary things just then. Humanity had been overburdened with the quiddities and quoddities of scholastic theology; it must not again be asked to bend the back to a similar burden. And so, without giving up his earlier position, Melanchthon strove to satisfy the practical claims of religion. If we have to-day a theological system that counts nothing human foreign to itself, it is because this prince of theologians thought it his highest duty to frame Christian doctrine for human nature's daily needs. Consequently, it is not necessary for us to see here a revolution in conception; but rather a re-disposition of thought in accordance with the deeper claims of the ethical sense.

THIRD PERIOD.—1535–1560.

SO-CALLED SYNERGISM.

There are several objections to the use of the term synergism to denote the character of the third period. It is not true in the historical sense, for the thought of Melanchthon is far removed from that of Pelagius, and he himself expressly condemns the errors of the Pelagians. Melanchthon never taught that the natural powers could inaugurate the beginnings of the new life, or be competent for inward obedience to God without the Holy Spirit. It is not true in the sense of Semi-Pelagianism; for though he held that the human powers were not utterly destroyed, he yet never adjudged any merit to human exertions, like Cassian and his school. It is not true in the technical sense, because a study of the entire period fails to show a single instance in which Melanchthon made the human will coördinate

*C. R. II., p. 547., Cf. Galle, p. 287.

with the Word and the Holy Spirit. It is always subordinate in action and secondary in time. It is not true in the common acceptation of the term, for its ordinary use has given the word a suspicious content that does injustice to Melanchthon's conception. His teaching lends no countenance to the notion that there are parts wrought separately by grace and by the human will in conversion. Grace is conceived by him to be active for good in all that is accomplished, though the will, because of its nature, is not passive and unresponsive. And yet the term may be used if we remember the above modifications, because there is no other to take its place, and because it expresses from the human standpoint the actual state of affairs in conversion. Individual cxperience teaches that the will of man is "not indeed idle," and that the Holy Spirit does not exercise his activity upon a "block or a statue."

It had been evident for a long time that Melanchthon was not satisfied with the second form of the *Loci.* The fact that he had stopped its publication in 1525 was sufficient witness to that. For ten years he delayed remodelling it in conformity to the alterations of his thought, only promising now and then that the work should be done. And yet it could be easily seen by consulting his publications during that time, especially the Commentaries on Collossians (1527) and on Romans (1532) what direction the emendations would take. At length, during the summer of 1533, he delivered a course of lectures on the elements of Christian doctrine, on which was based the new *Loci* issued in 1535. And this event must be taken as marking the final change in Melanchthon's conceptions. True, there were minor changes afterward; but, from this time on, the general trend of thought was fixed.

It would be useless to take up all the questions that are treated in this edition of the *Loci,* for most of them are in nowise different from the form given them in the commentaries above mentioned. What must be of chief interest to us in this place is his discussion of free will, and more particularly, the extent of human powers. And so we may set aside the allied questions of necessity and contingency, of general and special

actions, and consider that which gave so much occasion of stumbling to many.

Let us begin with this frequent thought of Melanchthon's: "Man cannot satisfy the law of God; for the divine law demands not only external deeds, but internal purity, fear, faith, the highest love of God, and, finally, perfect obedience."*, Since, however, this is impossible to corrupt nature, it must be added, "The human will is not able without the Holy Spirit to cause spiritual feelings."† But this is not to "deter men from the pursuit of obeying or believing, or not to attempt it. Rather, since we ought to begin with the Word, surely we must not resist the Word of God, but strive to yield to it, and consider the promise of the Gospel, which is universal. Moreover in real tests this can be judged move clearly than in idle disputations. * * * But although the will struggles with weakness, yet because it does not cast away the Word, but sustains itself by the Word, it obtains consolation. And the Holy Spirit is efficacious thereto through the Word, just as Paul says, Rom. 8: 26: The Spirit aids our infirmities? In this struggle the mind is to be exhorted to retain the Word by every endeavor. * * * In this example we see that these causes *unite*, the Word, the Holy Spirit, and the will, not indeed idle, but striving against its infirmity."‡

There will be no need of examining the other writings of this period, for the above words contain substantially all that is set forth in them. Of course, in the changing circumstances of after years, the different questions were discussed according to the needs of the moment. Sometimes Melanchthon seems to go still farther, as when, in the *Loci* of 1548, he inserts Erasmus' definition of free will—"the faculty of applying oneself to grace."§ At other times, his words seem to indicate a reaction toward a stricter view, especially the writings published after 1552, in which liberty is restricted to the government of the outward members alone.|| And yet there is no essential departure from the central position that "free will does something."¶

*C. R. XXI., 875. †Ibid. ‡C. R. XXI., 376.
§C. R. XXI., 659. ||C. R. XXII., 148, et al., ¶C. R. XXI., 657.

But now the question must be whether in the above words—and consequently in this whole period—Melanchthon advanced the doctrine of synergism in its complete form. At first thought this seems to be true, especially in the statement of the three causes of conversion. The will seems to be made co-operative with the Holy Spirit and the Word, since it is "not indeed idle." This impression is deepened when we read of the Holy Spirit "aiding," "assisting," *adjuvare*, the will in its struggle toward God, as if the will were the principal active agent, and the Spirit only accessory.* Moreover, when Melanchthon says, in the *Loci* of 1548, "aroused by the promise, we struggle with ourselves,"† all creative agency seems to be removed from the Spirit's activity through the Word.

Let it be again insisted upon, however, that Melanchthon's position throughout is eminently practical; he is arguing from the midst of experience. This is his meaning when he says: "These things understood rightly are true, and practice in the exercise of faith and in true consolation * * * will make plain this union of causes—the Word of God, the Holy Spirit, and the will."‡ Consequently his language is not to be taken in a technical sense; rather is it to be understood as the medium of one who adds to his teaching exhortation.

If this is remembered, most of the difficulties disappear, and the rest are not insurmountable. In this way Melanchthon no more denies creative activity in conversion to the Spirit than does Paul when he writes, Eph. 5 : 14; "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead; and Christ shall give thee light." In both instances, the expressions are rhetorical, but yet agree in a practical way with reality. In like manner, the argument from "*adjuvare*" is robbed of its power. A study of the word, as it recurs in connection with the Spirit's activity upon the will, proves that it is used to eliminate the idea of compulsion and to vindicate the ethical character of conversion.§

*C. R. XV., 619; XXIII., 282; XXI., 377, 663, XVI., 192.

†C. R. XXI., 659.

‡C. S. XXI., 660.

§C. R. XVI., 198; XXI., 656, 761, 891; XXIII., 290, et al., Cf. Herrlinger, pp., 91, 92.

Add to this that the word was used by Augustine, and by Melanchthon in the days of his absolute predestinarianism,* and the argument for synergism on this point will be destroyed.

Nor can the inference of synergism on account of the "three concurrent causes" be allowed. This is another instance of the rhetorical use of a word. In the technical sense, there is no "coöperation of causes" here. If the whole argument is taken, it will be seen that Melanchthon expressly denies to the human will the capacity for "perfect obedience." Without the Holy Spirit, man is impotent. If there is to be a beginning, it must be inaugurated by the Holy Spirit through the Word, the will not resisting. Consequently, in the moment of inception only two causes are really operative, and there is no real "coöperation." Immediately after, however,—not separable in point of time—the aroused activity of the will concurs with the other two causes, but not in the sense of equal coöperation; for "the human will is not able without the Holy Spirit to cause spiritual feelings."† Strictly speaking, this coöperative activity on the part of the will should be called "sub-operative;" in that way we should come nearer to the actual content of the "will not idle," that must at all events "do something." Everywhere Melanchthon insists on the divine initiative, and on the continued preëminence of the heavenly agents. In his latest writings he emphasized this position and worked out the details with greater clearness.‡ But he added nothing new to the argument already advanced, that the will ethically considered is active in conversion, but yet that the Spirit through the Word accomplishes all spiritual motions. He only elucidates his former position when he says: "It is perfectly plain that no man, by his natural powers, can banish death and the inborn evil inclinations, but God alone effects this."§ And so there is sufficient reason to believe that Melanchthon never taught the doctrine of synergism in any but a practical way.

*Cf., C. R. XXI., 47.
†C. R. XXI., 375.
‡Cf. Herrlinger, Theol., Melanchthon's, pp. 99, 106.
§C. R. XXII., 153, 161; XXIII., 433; IX., 339.

It has been regretted that Melanchthon was forced by the circumstances of his busy life to develop his system of doctrine in such a fragmentary way. Moreover, it has been considered a misfortune that his ethical sense forbade the composition of a strictly scientific dogmatic. It is true that many advantages would have arisen from such a production by one of so much authority, and so admirably equipped for the task. We may well believe that theological terms would have attained the last degree of precision, and that all knowledge in this field would have had its perfect adjustment to all other parts. But it is a question, after all, whether the loss would not have been greater than the gain.

However, the time was not propitious. The early experiment of Melanchthon in the field of absolute predestination had demonstrated the preëminent need of education for the masses in the practical affairs of religion. Moreover, that time of many new ideas clamoring for recognition was not the time for systemization. The theories must all be subjected to the test of time and experience before that could be done. The controversies during Melanchthon's own life are sufficient proof of that; for most of them would not have occurred if men had not been carried away by false premises which had their only support in logical processes.

But Melanchthon was wise in his choice. If the position he took was so open to misunderstanding, despite the many avenues that lead into the heart of its truth, what would have been the result if the other side had been adopted, where knowledge does not pass beyond the bare fact, where imagination fails, and of which Christ himself says: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou heareth the sound thereof; but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit"? Not that he neglected any part of divine truth. Melanchthon emphasized the necessity of the divine activity of grace just as much as the ethical activity of man; but with Socratic wisdom he did not presume to explain things he could not know.

We may be glad that Melanchthon's thought took the direc-

tion it did. If our theology to-day has that "sweet reasonableness" which brings into loving knowledge of God, it is because of his untiring efforts in that direction. This is the legacy of the "ἠθικός" of the Reformation to his spiritual descendents afar off. Like the prophecies of old, his message was to keep its richest gifts for those who in the light of larger days should read the meaning of his words. Since the stormy ages of theological controversy have passed, and the day of practical religion has come, men are better able to appreciate the greatness of the spirit that wrought in patience for humanity, and turned not aside after shadows.

ARTICLE V.

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD A PENTECOSTAL CLIMAX.

By Rev. Hiram King, A. B.

THE GENERAL SUBJECT.

The fatherhood of man is established, not in the sphere of direct creation, but in natural generation. The race is multiplied, not by direct creative acts, but in man's generative function, and men become parents only as they beget children. Were man to become childless, it is plain that the elimination of his fatherhood would be inevitable as well as the termination of his natural existence.

As touching the propagation of the race in natural generation, there are two essential features that distinguish true fatherhood: (1) that the child is generated from the *person* of the parent; (2) that in the process of generation, the *nature* of the parent is transmitted to the child.

These are the well-known conditions of the fatherhood of man and the race is propagated under their constant operation, the subsequent development of childhood into manhood being safeguarded by parental guidance and guardianship. Do the spiritual conditions of the fatherhood of God correspond to the natural conditions of the fatherhood of man? Is the father-

hood of man really the portraiture, in general outline, of the fatherhood of man? Analogical deduction will warrant the affirmation of the interrogative proposition.

The fatherhood of God, like the fatherhood of man, is not established in direct creation. Childhood is the sole and necessary condition of fatherhood, but God does not create children by direct acts, either under the domestic roof-tree, or in his spiritual kingdom. Of all the race, indeed, he thus created only Adam and Eve and they were not children. Fatherhood being then possible only in connection with childhood, it is certainly quite plain that the direct creation of the first man and the first woman did not make God the Father of the human race.

The natural fatherhood of God cannot be proven from the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15 : 11). The question as to whom the younger son represented can be intelligently determined only from the *occasion* of the parable. The Pharisees and Scribes had disapproved of the Lord's gracious attitude toward the publicans and sinners (V. 2), and he directed the parable against their objections. As the publicans and sinners had renounced their religious obligations and had come to the Lord to hear him, they evidently were themselves the real prodigals. The younger son therefore represented, not the Gentile nations, but the graceless Jews.

The fatherhood of God is established, not in his creative function, but in the sphere of regeneration. The process of regeneration, moreover, like that of natural generation, culminates in *child-birth*. The subjects of regeneration are therefore the *offspring* of God. The race are now begotten anew, not of man, but of God. Man is "born again," not at the hearth-stone of the home, but at the font of the Church.

Is then the child of God, like the child of man, generated from the *person* of its progenitor? Certainly. The person of the progenitor is the only medium of generation, the progeny being the "fruit of his loins."

In regeneration, moreover, as in natural generation, the *nature* of the progenitor is transmitted to the progeny. A man, although distinguished from other men, is nevertheless the dupli-

cate of his natural ancestor to the extent of being wholly human. Does he, then, in his birth of God become divine? He partakes of the "divine nature" (2 Peter 1 : 4), but, being the "new man" (Eph. 2 : 15), he remains also human.

Is, however, the divine nature simply *added* to man in his new birth, his human nature remaining unchanged? and does the new man therefore lead a dual life—half human? half divine? The question has a most important bearing on this discussion, and the correct answer will point, as a finger, to the key of the entire logical and exegetical situation, namely, the Person of Christ.

No one would seriously contend that the divine nature, as transmitted in regeneration, comes only into *conjunction* with the human nature of its subjects. That would not be the new birth, nor, indeed, any birth, and would, moreover, be out of harmony with both reason and revelation. Origin in birth, quite the contrary, involves the *constitution of being*, and therefore implies the *unity* of all the constituents in personality. Conjunction of components may be possible in mechanics, but is not in generation. As the new birth is quite as real as the natural birth, it is plain that the divine and the human elements must be *unified* in the being of the new man.

Regeneration implies, however, not the transformation of the old humanity in its subjects, but the transmission of the new humanity to them from God. The conclusion is therefore fully warranted that human nature, to be thus transmitted in the new birth, must be *generic* in God.

This logical outcome, that God, as the Father of man in the sphere of regeneration, must be *human* as well as divine, implies evidently the incarnation itself, the climax of the Old Testament economy. Does reason, however, bear the test of revelation? Do the Scriptures justify the logical conclusion from the premise of man's regeneration, *that God has become incarnate?* Yes, just as the discovery of the new planet justified the astronomer's conclusion of its existence from the premise of its influence. Not only do the Scriptures declare that the

Second Person of the Holy Trinity "became flesh" (John 1 : 14), but the four Gospels are his biography.

At the beginning of the discussion, regeneration was assumed as the sphere of the fatherhood of God because it is an obvious, and, therefore, undisputed fact. Regeneration itself, however, proceeds from Christ as the "last Adam" (1 Cor. 15 : 45), who is therefore not the *Creator* of the new man but his Progenitor. The ultimate ground of the fatherhood of God is, accordingly, not the regeneration of man, but the Person of Christ.

Christ is the author of man's regeneration because it is in him that God is incarnate. He is equally human and divine, inasmuch as his Person was constituted by the union of the human and divine natures. Christ is, moreover, not an ordinary member of the race, aside even from his divinity. He not only derived human nature from his mother, but he assumed the order of human life, and thus became *generic* for man's spiritual generation. The new humanity was therefore potentially in Christ as the natural race was originally in Adam.

The new creation, which thus originated in Christ, is an *order* of existence quite as much as the natural creation. In either realm, principle and law are regnant. The sole medium of introduction into either order of life is, moreover, the generative function. Natural humanity can be propagated only in generation from men. Spiritual humanity can be brought into being only in regeneration from God. As, now, the regenerative function is not in the being of God as such, but is in the Person of Christ, and as, moreover, the Person of Christ was constituted only in his birth of the Virgin Mary, the decisive conclusion follows, *that the new birth is limited to the Christian era.**

As however, the generations under the old covenant were the

*It is true that Scripture terminology represents God as Father aside from the actual incarnation (Ex. 4 : 22, Deut. 14 : 1, 32 : 6, Isa. 63 : 16, 64 : 8, Jer. 31 : 9, Acts 17 : 28, 19). The sense in which the paternal relation is predicated of God is, however, not uniform (Deut. 32 : 6, Isa. 64 : 8, Acts 17 : 28, 29), and cannot, therefore, imply his true fatherhood in every case, nor, indeed, can it in any case, because it is not based on the true *generation* of man from him. Out of Christ, God is without the generative function, and the fatherhood of God can be only metaphorical or typical.

people of God (Ex. 3 : 8), were they also his children? it may be asked. As well might Cain have been born before the creation of the *first Adam* as a child of God before the birth of the "last Adam." The law of cause and effect is, indeed, the necessary order in the spiritual realm as well as in the physical universe. Revelation, like nature, is *orderly*, and the order of procedure, in either sphere, is from cause to effect. As, moreover, an effect is *produced*, the priority of its cause is plainly indispensable, and therefore *invariable*. As touching the origination of the natural universe, it is evident that the sequence was from cause to effect, since "God created the heaven and the earth." As the new creation *also* was produced and is therefore an effect quite as clearly as the natural creation itself, the priority of *its* cause in the *Person of Christ* cannot even be doubtful.

It is thus demonstrated by logic that the new birth could not precede the incarnation. Does revelation, however, confirm the deductions of logic? Yes.

The Jews in the time of Christ were "an holy nation" (Ex. 19 : 6) quite as much as their forefathers had been. They observed the ordinances of the old covenant and enjoyed its grace. Their *religious status* was the highest attainable by man prior to the incarnation, and they were challenged by the higher relation in Christ as *being already consecrated to Jehovah.* They were, indeed, "his own" people (John 1 : 11) to whom the Messiah "came." Did God, however, treat them as his *children* in their transition from Judaism to Christianity? No, as will appear from the following:

1. God's message to the Jews by the forerunner of Christ was, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 3 : 2). The contents of the message were, first, that the Jews must repent as a preliminary to their entrance into the kingdom of heaven; and, second that the kingdom of heaven was, as yet, "at hand." It is but every day reason that the Jews, although the "chosen" and "peculiar" people, could not have been the "new man" for fifteen centuries before the establishment of the kingdom of heaven.

2. The Lord himself declared to Nicodemus that a man's

admission to new covenant relations depended wholly on his *new birth* as the condition. "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3 : 5), he said. Evidently, Jew and Gentile alike must receive spiritual birth at the font of the Church.

If, now, the Christian philosopher is to assume the regeneration of the Jews under their economy, he also, like this Jewish teacher, will ask in perplexity: "How can these things be"? For clearly the Jew could not be regenerated the *second* time any more than the natural birth can be repeated.

3. St. John writes that the Lord gave those of his people, who received him, the "right to become children of God" (1 : 12). These original believers were not only Jews, but they were the best Jews, and yet they were only "born of God" (John 1 : 13) after the advent of Christ.

4. According to St. Paul, Christ broke down the "middle wall of partition" (Ep. 2 : 14) between Jew and Gentile, that he might "create in himself of the twain one new man" (Ep. 2 : 15). The origin of the new man is here referred, not to Judaism, but to the Person of Christ, in whose assumption of human nature, the distinction of Jew and Gentile was thus lost in the new creation. Since therefore Christ "created" the new man "in himself," it is perfectly plain that the regeneration of man did not precede the incarnation.

Although the Person of Christ is the source of the new creation, the actual Regenerator is, not Christ himself, but the Holy Spirit. The descent of the Third Person of the Trinity was as necessary for man's *personal regeneration* as was the advent of the Second Person for the new creation itself. It is, indeed, the the function of the Spirit, and not of Christ, to consummate the new birth (John 3 : 5, 6, 8). The order of revelation itself was: (1) the advent of Christ; (2) the glorification of Christ; (3) the descent of the Spirit. These were not disconnected events in the course of revelation, but the stages of revelation itself in its historical development, and the order of their sequence could not possibly have been different. The first stage developed into the second, which was the exaltation of Christ.

The second stage developed into the third, which is the sphere of man's new birth. The *practical* climax of revelation was therefore, not the birth of Christ, but the gift of the Spirit. At Christmas, men were *spectators* of the divine benevolence; at Pentecost, they became its *subjects*.

That the descent of the Spirit *was thus* the normal outcome of the ascension of Christ and therefore could not have preceded that event, is not left in doubt. "For the Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (John 7 : 39). Thus affirms the apostle. "For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you, but if I go, I will send him unto you" (John 16 : 7). This is the Lord's way of indicating the sequence of revelation. He, moreover, instructed the disciples to "wait for the promise of the Father" (the gift of the Spirit).

That Pentecost was, indeed, the culmination of the advent of Christ is also not to be called in question. The Lord did not "go away" *as into retirement* and "send" the Spirit *as his successor*. To the contrary, the ascension of Christ was not the interruption of his advent, but his emancipation from natural conditions in the *spiritualization* of his Person. The ascension was therefore not the withdrawal of Christ, but the climax of his advent. Indeed, the incarnation itself, as the essential union of God and man in the birth of Christ, made his presence with man perpetual as he himself declares: "Lo, I am with you alway" (Matt. 28 : 20). The Lord's announcement of his departure and the contingent descent of the Spirit (John 16 : 7) was, accordingly, equivalent to saying that he would be translated into the spiritual order, and that the Holy Spirit would regenerate men from his Person in the power of his incarnate life *thus glorified*.

As the Holy Spirit was not to "speak from himself" (John 16 : 13) but reveal Christ exclusively (John 16 : 14, 15), and as, moreover, in Christ there "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. 2 : 9), it clearly follows that Pentecost was the supreme self-revelation of God for the institution of the new creation. In its Pentecostal expression, then, revelation reached

its true, historical climax, and is not unitarian but Trinitarian. It was, indeed, the revelation of the *Economic Trinity* in the world, that was signalized by the supernatural display at Pentecost, and the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are at the sacred font to give birth to the new man (Matt. 28 : 19).*

The final Pentecost of Judaism became thus the practical institution of the Christian era, and the new economy is in the sharpest contrast with the old. "The day of first-fruits," from field and vineyard in Palestine, has now changed character as fully as did the Jewish Passover on the eve of Calvary. It is now the feast of "first-fruits" in the world's new creation, with *men* for grain, and when the day is done, the reapers have already borne into the garner three thousand sheaves from the fields "white unto the harvest." Men formerly turned their faces to the future and trusted in the Messianic promise; they now trust in the Messiah and enjoy the grace of the Messianic advent. The "last days" have come, and God "has poured forth of his Spirit" with the unexampled effect foretold by the prophet, "And it shall be, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Acts 2 : 17–21). God has, indeed, done a "new thing," having made "a way in the wilderness and rivers in the desert" (Isaiah 43 : 19). The apostles of Christ, upon

*The descent of the Spirit at Pentecost did not imply his prior exclusion from the world and his non-activity among men. The agency of the Spirit was, indeed, a prominent feature of pre-Christian revelation all along. The Spirit participated in the work of creation (Gen. 1 : 2), combatted evil in the heart of man (Gen. 6 : 3), made handicraftsmen skilful (Ex. 31 : 3), qualified men for military leadership (Judges 6 : 34), made the prophets the spokesmen of God (2 Peter 1 : 2), came on Saul and changed his heart (1 Sam. 10 : 6, 9), was the author of the miraculous conception of Christ (Matt. 1 : 20), descended on him at his baptism (Luke 3 : 22), and led him into the wilderness (Luke 4 : 1).

When, however, the Lord declared that the Spirit's coming was contingent on his own departure (John 16 : 7), he assumed that he had never come at all in the sense in which he would "send him." The Spirit should, indeed, be the *administrative Mediator* between Christ and man (John 16 : 14, 15). The *Pentecostal* mission of the Spirit is, therefore, *to carry into practical effect the advent of Christ*, by giving spiritual birth to men form the Person of Christ, and making concrete in their lives the grace of the new covenant.

whom his mantle fell (John 20 : 21), are now "baptized with the Holy Ghost" (Acts 1 : 5) and have received "power" (Acts 1 : 8) to begin a truer world-conquest (Matt. 28 : 18–20) than that by Alexander. The kingdom of heaven is no longer "at hand," but established, and men are "born of water and the Spirit" (John 3 : 5) as the condition of the celestial citizenship. Men are now babes, not in the cradle but in Christ, and are therefore *new creatures* (2 Cor. 5 : 17). These are plainly the first-born of the "last Adam," and God is at length the Father of man.

THE SPIRITUAL STATUS OF THE JEWS.

As the fatherhood of God was not established in Judaism, what was the spiritual status of the Jews?

1. *The Jews were not saved from sin in Judaism.* The truth of the proposition will appear in contrasting the offerings by the Aaronic priest for expiation and the offering by Christ.

It is axiomatic in soteriology that salvation is not possible without forgiveness of sin, and that forgiveness of sin is necessarily associated with the new birth. Since then the Jews were not born of the Spirit, it follows that sin was not abolished, and that therefore salvation was not accomplished under the old covenant. Do the Scriptures confirm the conclusion? And do they imply the lack of soteriological provisions among the Old Testament institutions?

As touching the *source* of salvation, St. Peter thus sounds the key-note: "And in none other (than in Jesus Christ) is there salvation; for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved" (Acts 4 : 12). As the "name" of Jesus Christ was not "given among men" till the close of Judaism, it is quite plain that it was not even in the Jewish vocabulary. How then could the Jews have *spoken* this *open sesame* to salvation? The Lord indeed became the "author (cause)* of eternal salvation" (Heb. 5 : 9), but only through the sufferings of his natural life (Heb. 2 : 10). How then could the Jews have been saved, since the "cause" of

*See *Αἴτιος*.

salvation did not even exist contemporaneously with Judaism? Or could the effect have *lawlessly* preceded the "cause," notwithstanding the Jewish economy was the world's most rigid system of *law and order?*

That the salvation of man in the forgiveness of sin *followed* the Messianic advent, appears indeed from the general declaration of purpose at the institution of Christianity itself. Then the Infant Messiah was to be called Jesus (Matt. 1 : 21). "For it is he that shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1: 21, Jer. 33 : 16), the angel Gabriel explained. Zacharias prophesied that the Messianic proclamation would be "to give knowledge of salvation unto his people in the remission of their sins" (St. Luke 1 : 77). The Baptist pointed out the Lord as the "Lamb of God which taketh the sin of the world" (John 1 : 29). St. Peter declared that God exalted Jesus to be a "Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentence to Israel, and remission of sins" (Acts 5 : 31). All this is, moreover, the fulfillment of Jeremiah's prophesy of the Messianic epoch, that God would make a new covenant with his people, put his "laws into their mind" and write them "on their heart," and that he would be to them "a God" and they should be to him "a people"; and, furthermore, that their sins would he "remember no more" (Heb. 8 : 8–13).

The new covenant is the proper, historical advance of revelation from the old covenant, and therefore cannot be its *duplicate.* Wherein, then, do the two covenants differ? It is plain that the distinguishing features of the new covenant were to be, first the *laws of God in the mind of the people and on their heart* (regeneration), and, second, the *remission of their sins.* It is equally plain that the prior existence of these new covenant features was quite impossible. For if they had *characterized* the old covenant, they manifestly could not *distinguish* the new.

The Scriptures, indeed, declare the *inadequacy* of Old Testament expiation for the removal of sin. On the day of atonement, the Jewish high-priest, as the divinely appointed mediator of the Old Testament, sprinkled the blood of the "bullock of the sin offering" and the blood of the "goat of the sin offering"

at the mercy-seat within the veil. At the "end of the atoning for the holy place," he laid his hands on the head of the scapegoat at the altar before the tent, confessing over him the sins of the people, and then sent him into the wilderness bearing them (Lev. 16 : 5–22). Such was the atonement for sin under the Mosaic dispensation. As to its merits, the Scriptures, however, declare as follows: "But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins year by year. For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins" (Heb. 10 : 3, 4). To like effect is Hebrews 9 : 6–10. The priests entered continually into the "first tabernacle" (holy place) and ministered at the golden altar (v. 6). The high-priest, however, entered the "second" (holy of holies) only once a year, and not without an offering of blood for himself and the people (v. 7). The Holy Ghost thus "signified" that the way into the divine presence behind the veil was not made "manifest," while the first tabernacle was yet standing (v. 8). It would, indeed, seem that the Holy place, as separated from the holy of holies, was a "parable," and signified the utter inadequacy of the Jewish rites of expiation to secure forgiveness of sin, and thereby satisfy the moral self-consciousness (v. 9). The sacrifices themselves are, accordingly, characterized as having been "only carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation" (v. 10.)

To the contrary in every particular did Christ minister at the heavenly mercy-seat. He sent no scapegoat into the wilderness; nor did he bear into the spiritual tabernacle the reeking oblation of Judaism. Priest and victim in one, he was the Lamb of God in self-immolation, In this unique offering, there was not "a remembrance made of sins" (Heb 10 : 3), but Christ was "manifested to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Heb. 9 : 26). "He loosed us from our sins by his blood" (Rev. 1 : 5). Unlike the Aaronic priest, "he entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9 : 12). The writer to the Hebrews explains, furthermore, that the self-offering by Christ was final, because it was adequate to the removal of sin; "Now where remission of these (sins and iniquities) is, there is no more offering for sin (Heb. 10 : 18).

As touching the expiatory merits of the two covenants, respectively, and their consequent soteriological bearing, they are set in contrast by the following passage: And every priest indeed standeth day by day ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins: But he, when he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God (Heb. 10 : 11, 12). The sacrifices by the priests were offered daily, because they could "never take away sins." The one sacrifice by Christ was offered "forever," because it abolished sin.

This revelation here also confirms the findings of reason, the plain teaching of the Scriptures being that the sin offerings of the Jews did not take away sin. Salvation was indeed impossible in Judaism for want of a Saviour, just as the new birth itself was impossible for want of a spiritual progenitor.

2. *The Jews were in grace.* It is "by grace" that men are saved in Christianity (Ep. 2 : 8). But it does not follow that Judaism was *without* grace because the Jews were not saved. "By the grace of God I am what I am" was as true a self-estimate by the Jew as it was by the Christian. It was, indeed, by divine grace that the marvels of the Jewish history were wrought from Abraham to Christ. Moses received divine consecration at the "burning bush" to lead the Jews out of Egypt, and to formulate their politico-religious institutions at Horeb. His shepherd's staff became the "rod of God," and made its bearer greater than Pharaoh. It was endowed with *sacramental qualities*, and became the medium of divine intervention in behalf of the Jews. It was by means of the rod that Pharaoh was compelled to let the people go; that the bottom of the sea became a high-way for their escape into Arabia; that the late herdsmen of Goshen were transformed into victorious warriors at Rephadim, and that the "rock" was made a fountain.

It was, however, in his own proper person that the great Jewish lawgiver was the mediator of God's gracious manifestations to his people. He parted the waters of the Red Sea in Egypt, nnd the *typical* "day of Pentecost was now come." In their baptism "unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Cor.

10 : 2), the Spirit fell on all the people to abide with them as the constant inspiration of their religious institutions. A fit type this of the Christian Pentecost, when a high-way should be made through a redder sea (Rev. 7 : 14) than that of Egypt, that men might be baptized in the Archetypal Deliverer himself (Gal. 3 : 27), escape from a greater tyrant (Heb. 2 : 14, 15) than Pharaoh, and enjoy a better freedom (John 8 : 36) than that of the Arabian desert. Not only, however, did the people receive spiritual consecration through Moses but they ate "spiritual meat," thereafter, and drank "spiritual drink." Although the reference is to the miraculous supply of the daily hunger and thirst of the Jews, the assumption is surely warranted that the manna and the rock-fountain represented, for their faith, the truer "spiritual" meat and drink of the soul. St. Paul indeed calls the "rock" Christ (1 Cor. 10 : 4).

At Sinai, Moses was even the *mouth-piece of God* for the promulgation of the ordinances of the Theocratic constitution, and the appointment of the rites and ceremonies of the Old Testament religion. When subsequently, tabernacle and temple were filled with the divine glory, and the Shechinah hovered over the mercy-seat, God was increasingly helpful and gracious to his people through the ministrations of his representatives, the priests. He heard their prayers at the golden altar when they rose on the cloud of incense; accepted the sacrifices they offered in faith; and sent them the holy prophets with the messages of his grace.

The Christians are saved by grace, but only through faith (Eph. 2 : 8). Had the Jews faith, notwithstanding Judaism was without saving grace? Yes, and the conclusive proof of the affirmation is contained in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. The writer, in the first place, presents such an array of believers as is not elsewhere catalogued; and, in the second, he declares that none of them "received the promise" (v. 89). Although the Messianic promise was, as yet, not fulfilled, the Old Testament people were not only believers, but their faith was invincible.

Was the faith of the Jews, however, concerned wholly with

the future, and was it therefore without present fruition? No. The contents of the Jewish faith was promise in its *ideal* fulfillment, since it is the function of faith to thus give typical reality* to "things hoped for" (Heb. 11 : 1). The grace of the Jewish faith was the Messiah in his *ideal* advent, which was most real, for it was the "shadow of the good things to come" (Heb. 10 : 1). The contents of the Christian faith are, however, "the good things" themselves, and these, in their final analysis, are Christ. The Jewish faith was therefore the medium through which the "shadow" of *Christ* was thrown forward many centuries, Abraham himself seeing thus the "day" of Christ. It was, accordingly, the "shadow" of Christ that was the marvelous grace of Judaism from the beginning, and under whose influence the Jews were "an holy people unto the Lord" (Deut. 14 : 2) and became heroes of faith (Heb. 11 : 1–40).

The Jewish economy was then clearly *preliminary*—elementary in a measure—to the kingdom of heaven. The light of Judaism was the dawn of day, presently to be glorified into the morning of Christianity. This pre-Christian twilight was the reflection of the "true light," which was, as yet, below the horizon. The light of Judaism was therefore the type of the world's coming illumination, just as the dáwn in nature is the type of the day it heralds. The dawn in the moral sphere is produced by the rising luminary as much as the dawn in nature is thus produced. Since, moreover, the dawn is really the indirect light of the sun, it must needs partake of the nature of the day, itself, into which it is glorified at sunrise. Judaism, therefore, partook of the nature of Christianity, and the Jews were in the opening twilight of the "day of Christ," which broke in radiant splendor upon the new earth at Pentecost, as the "sun of righteousness" began to ascend the ecliptic of the new heavens.

As to the spiritual status af the Jews, the following declarations seem to be warranted:

1. It is quite impossible that the scapegoat could have car-

*See Ὑπόστασις.

ried into the wilderness the sins of the people in annual installments, or that the blood of his slain associate could have washed them away at the mercy-seat.

2. The expiatory rites of Judaism were typical, and could therefore only symbolize the real expiation to be made by Christ.

3. The ordinances of Judaism, though "carnal," were, on the one hand, the means of Old Testament grace, and, on the other, they held in *abeyance the evil powers* until the time of "reformation."

4. The entire ceremonial system of Judaism was typical, and was therefore the medium through which the "shadow of the good things to come" was projected into the life and experience of the Jews, under power of their faith.

5. The Jews were in grace as the children of God (Gal. 4 : 1, 2), but their spiritual childhood was typical, since they received "the adoption of sons" only at the advent of Christ (Gal. 4 : 5).*

6. The grace of Judaism was the *ideal* Christ, become visible to faith in the Old Testament day-dawn of Christianity.

THE INVISIBLE CHURCH ALSO CHRISTIAN.

When men became the children of God, historical Judaism was assumed into the higher order of Christianity, and ceased to exist. It was, indeed, in the natureof things that the covenant with Abraham should end with its fulfillment in Christ. Only those Jews, who were loyal to the Old Testament obligations and maintained the purity of the Messianic faith, really represented Judaism at the advent of the Messiah, and they became *Christians* when they "received" him. It was, indeed, "of" both

*It would hardly do to apply the figure of a minor son to the Jews (Gal. 4 : 1, 2), without limitations. The Lord was sent to redeem the Jews from the law (Gal. 4 : 5). He accomplished their deliverance by suffering the curse of the law on the cross (Gal. 3 : 13). The practical emancipation of the Jews depended, however, on their personal acceptance of the crucified Christ, and it is certainly quite plain that their faith in him involved their *new birth* (1 John 5 : 1, John 1 : 12, 25). While therefore the minor son *develops* into his majority, the Jew was *born* into his.

the Jew and the Gentile that the Lord created the "new man" (Ep. 2 : 15), and the "new man" is neither Jew nor Gentile, but Christian. The Jew, accordingly, ceased to exist, ecclesiastically, at Pentecost.

Did, now, the Holy Spirit fall on the believing dead in his Pentecostal effusion, and were they also "born again" as the new creation was thus inaugurated among the living? Did the Jew cease to exist among the dead as well as among the living? and did the invisible Church, therefore, become Christian as well as the visible Church? It would seem so. Judaism could not exist contemporaneously with Christianity, in the world to come, any more than in the present. It is manifestly out of the nature of things, that, in the vast community of the righteous dead, there should still exist the religious distinctions, which marked the stages of revelation from Adam to Christ. It is not reasonable that the faith of the dead should be Patriarchal, or Jewish, or Christian according to the periods of revelation in which they respectively lived. It cannot be that the Jewish dead have still only the "shadow of the good things to come," and are yet trusting in the Messianic promise, while the Christian dead possess the *substance* of the "good things," and enjoy the grace of the Messianic advent. The personal faith of the dead cannot be thus diverse. For how could the Church, being thus without homogeneity, possibly be the "body" of Christ (Ep. 1 : 23), and the "true vine" (John 15 : 1–8), since both figures imply, not only the similarity of all its members in form; but also their oneness in essence. The Church among the living and the dead must indeed always have been identical with itself, whether Patriarchal, Jewish or Christian, since the invisible Church is really the visible Church transplanted, with all its increasing light and growing life. Death being neither the mental nor moral negation of its subjects, the dying believer goes not into the darkness, but bears with himself the revelation which he enjoyed in life, to add to the general illumination in the world to come. It is plainly not possible that the primitive believers should still remain in the semi-darkness of the Patriarchal period, since the invisible Church has been illumi-

nated, for ages, by such brilliant lights as the prophets of the Old Testament and the apostles of the New. How, indeed, could those be ignorant of the Lord's advent, with whom he was present from Good Friday to Easter Sunday? Nor can any one imagine that when St. Stephen had committed his spirit to the Christ whom he saw in glory (Acts 7 : 55–59), he presently found himself in a *Jewish* communion of departed saints. Christ is, indeed, the Head of the Church for the believing dead as much as for the living (Phil. 2 : 9–11), and as all believers are members of his "body," they must all be *Christians.*

As now, the Headship of Christ was established in the new birth of the Church at Pentecost, it follows that the invisible Church became Christian then as well as the visible Church.

That the advent of Christ *is thus* extended to the invisible Church is clearly taught in Hebrews 11 : 39, 40. The writer having named the illustrious believers of the generations before Christ, declares that they "receive not the promise" (v. 39). He furthermore declares that God has "provided (or foreseen) some better thing concerning us" (v. 40). The "better thing" could only be the *fulfillment* of the "promise" in the institution of Christianity. The pre-Christian believers, it appears, were not "made perfect" (v. 40) "apart from us" (v. 40), that is, not before God had provided the "better thing concerning us." When therefore the "better thing" *was* provided in the advent of Christ, the contingency ceased to exist, and the Old Testament believers who could not be "made perfect" *apart* from us were manifestly "made perfect" *with* us.

All believers were thus baptized with the One Spirit to profess one faith in the One Lord, and the One God became the Father of all.

ARTICLE VI.

MORMONISM, ITS HISTORY, DOCTRINES, STRENGTH, METHODS AND AIMS.

By Rev. P. Anstadt, D. D.

Mormonism is one of the sorest plague-spots of our body politic. It originated 70 years ago, and during the first 40 years of its existence was regarded as a harmless delusion, which would soon pass away. But quite the contrary has been the result. Since its establishment in Utah it has grown in the number of its adherents, in wealth, power and influence to such an extent, that the whole country has been aroused to a sense of the danger threatening our Christian civilization from the influence of Mormon polygamy. Especially since Utah has been admitted as a sovereign state of the Union, and since a professed and practical polygamist has been elected to a seat in Congress, in defiance of the solemn obligation that polygamy should be discontinued, has the nation been aroused to indignant opposition, and most earnest and numerously signed petitions have been sent to Congress opposing his admission to a seat in the House of Representatives.

Especially has the League for Social Service, under the superintendence of Dr. Josiah Strong, of New York, entered into a vigorous campaign against Mormonism. This League has, up to this time, published and distributed broadcast over the whole country, about *one million* of Anti-mormon Leaflets. These leaflets are small tracts or pamphlets, in which the which the following subjects are discussed:

No. 1. "Methods of Mormon Missionaries," by Rev. Wm. R. Campbell, (12 years in Utah.)

No. 2. "Present Attitude of Mormonism," by Rev. R. G. McNiece, D. D., (21 years in Utah.)

No. 3. "Historical Sketch of Mormonism," by Rev. D. J. McMillan, D. D., (10 years in Utah.)

No. 4. "Articles of Faith of the 'Latter-Day Saints,' with Mormon Explanations," Compiled by Rev. J. D. Nutting (5 years in Salt Lake City) and Rev. D. J. McMillan, D. D.

No. 5. "Political Aspects of Mormonism," by Rev. Josiah Strong, D. D.

No. 6. "Ten reasons why Christians can not Fellowship the Mormon Church." Issued by the Presbytery of Utah, and endorsed by the Congregational and Baptist Associations of Utah.

No. 7. "Reasons why B. H. Roberts should be expelled from the U. S. Congress."

Send 2 cents postage for Annual Report and specimen leaflet.

Sample copies of these seven leaflets were sent *free* by mail to 50,000 ministers, Christian Endeavor Societies, Young Men's Christian Associations etc., over the whole country, and fully 800,000 copies have been sent by freight and express in packages of from one hundred to several thousand, to persons, churches or societies ordering them. All this literature has been sent free of charge, except transportation for freight or express. All the expenses incurred by the publication of this enormous amount of literature have been met by voluntary contributions; one wealthy and benevolent lady alone gave her check for $6,000.

When at the opening of Congress, in December last, Brigham H. Roberts presented himself to be sworn in as a member elect from the state of Utah to a seat in the House of Representatives, objections were at once raised against his reception and a committee was appointed to investigate his right to a seat in the House.

The committee after a thorough investigation brought in two reports, a majority and a minority report. The former recommended his exclusion, the latter that he be sworn in and seated, and then immediately expelled. The committee was therefore unanimous on his rejection, but disagreed only on technical points of procedure.

On the 25th of January the vote was taken in the House of Representatives and resulted in his rejection by a majority of 278 to 50.

But the war against Mormonism has not been ended by the exclusion of Brigham H. Roberts from a seat in the House of Representatives; it has probably now only fairly begun. The Mormons will likely raise the cry of persecution, appeal to the sympathy of the people, and make renewed efforts to propagate their abonimable system. They are still sending out missionaries to make proselytes not only in every state in the Union, but also in most of the European countries. Quite recently some thirty or more of these missionaries of "the Church of the Latter Day Saints" sailed from our ports to England, Germany and Scandinavia. It is therefore proposed to continue the publication of anti-Mormon literature, still more extensively not only in the English language but also in translations into the German and Swedish languages.

My object in this way is, to compile from the anti-Mormon leaflets a brief abstract of the history, doctrines, methods, numerical strength and political influence of Mormonism.

Mormonism originated 70 years ago. During 40 years of this time it was regarded as a harmless delusion which would soon pass away; but quite the contrary has been the result, and the sooner the nation realizes the growing power of Mormonism the better it will be.

The Mormons date the origin of what they call their church from Palmyra, N. Y., April 6, 1830, with 6 members; namely, Joseph Smith, Jr., his brothers Hiram and Samuel H. Smith, Peter Whitmer and David his brother and Oliver Cowdery.

The family of Joseph Smith claims to be of Scotch extraction, and to have lived in New England ever since 1700. The mother was a fortune-teller, and both parents were illiterate. They were among the people who followed a strange delusion under one Wingate, who by the use of what he called "St. John's Rod," claimed to be able to discover gold, silver, currents of water underground, medicinal roots and to cure all manner of diseases. They also harped much on the lost ten tribes of Isreal, their restoration and a "latter day glory." The whole movement proved to be a scheme of a band of swindlers. Wingate, the leader, was arrested but escaped justice.

Joseph Smith's birth occurred about the time when the Wingate delusion was at its height. He grew up without refinement. His parents were ignorant, indolent and intemperate. He had health and strength and an active mind. Being without school advantages, he followed his own crude ideas. He was about fifteen years of age when he began to see visions and dream dreams. He was absent from his father's house seeking employment in various capacities.

A Rev. Solomon Spaulding, of Pittsburg, Pa., had written a novel which he called the "Manuscript Found." He advanced the theory that the Indians of this country descended from two colonies, one of which came from the town of Babylon; the other many centuries later from Jerusalem. Mr. Spaulding died without having his manuscript published. A Rev. Rigdon, a sensational preacher, then also residing at Pittsburg, became deeply interested in this novel and must have copied it, and changed it by introducing many passages of Scripture, so as to make it appear to be a revelation from God.

During his wandering Joseph Smith was for a time in the employ of William H. Sabine, at whose house the widow of Rev. Spaulding was making her home. In the garret of the house he found stowed away in an old trunk Mr. Spaulding's "Manuscript Found." Soon after his return to his father's house he was visited by Rev. Rigdon, who had in the meantime removed to Mentor, O., where he had gathered a large congregation. These two were also joined by Parley P. Pratt, a traveling tinker and preacher of some ability, also a member of Rigdon's church. Mr. Pratt plied his twofold vocation between Palmyra, New York, and Mentor, Ohio, and was a great admirer of Mr. Rigdon.

After his acquaintance with Mr. Rigdon in 1827 Joseph said, he was told in dreams and visions, that he was chosen of the Lord to be a great prophet, to restore the gospel which had been taken from the work many centuries ago. He went so far as to declare that an angel came into his room at midnight, awoke him, read 5 chapters out of this Bible to him and then took him to a hill which he called Cumorah. The hill is four

miles from Palmyra, and is owned at present by Admiral Sampson. There Joseph claims to have discovered the wonderful Mormon plates and unearthed them by the help of the angels. He describes the plates as bound by rings in the form of a book and concealed in a stone vault, where they had been hidden from the wicked world 1400 years. The plates, he says, were four inches wide and eight inches long, and about as thick as ordinary tin sheets, forming a book about six inches thick.

Joseph concealed himself behind a curtain (which was a bed-blanket), stretched diagonally across one corner of his mother's kitchen, and there read, what he claims, was a translation of the engravings on the plates, to a scribe who sat outside of the blanket, and heard what Smith pretended to read. Thus the *Book of Mormon* was produced. Eleven men testified that they saw the plates, but none of them were able to read anything that was engraved on them, so that we have only Joseph Smith's word for what they contained.

Immediately after the translation of the plates the Mormon church was organized. Joseph Smith was baptized and ordained by Oliver Cowdery; then Oliver Cowdery was baptized and ordained by Joseph Smith.

In October the number of members had increased to about 75. The Rev. Sidney Rigdon became an enthusiastic convert. He said it was that light which he had been long expecting to break forth from the divine mind. Of course the whole of Mr. Rigdon's peculiar church at Mentor, O., was at once absorbed.

When the Mormon church was organized only 5 of the 11 witnesses joined it. Oliver Cowdery, one of these and the one that acted as scribe, were cut off from the church a few years later and turned over to the buffetings of Satan, for lying, theft and living in open adultery with a servant girl. Cowdery died a miserable drunkard. Martin, another of the five, was also cut off for wickedness, and Joseph Smith said of him that he was not fit for decent people to notice. Two others of the original five, and witnesses of the plates, were, after some years, sent to jail for immorality and crime, and then shot by a mob who broke into the jail.

Kirtland became the headquarters of the church where a temple was erected at a cost of $40,000. But the establishment of a fraudulent bank led to their being driven out from the community by the indignant citizens. According to Smith's own testimony he and Rigdon had to flee from justice at midnight.

Three kinds of charges followed Smith everywhere up to his death, namely, *immorality*, to cover up which the doctrine of spiritual marriages and the practice of polygamy began to be justified as early as 1836. A second charge, which invariably followed him, was *dishonesty* in matters of money, as the Kirtland bank scandal shows. A third charge was *theft*. To justify this crime he asserted that Mormons were God's peculiar people, to whom it was God's purpose to give the whole world and all that is therein. "For the meek shall inherit the earth," and the Mormons were the only meek people.

In 1832 Brigham Young, from Boston, a painter and glacier, became a convert. He first met Smith in the fall of that year at Kirtland, and was the first to use the gabble called "the gift of tongues."

The next effort at permanent settlement was made at Independence, Jackson Co., Missouri. Joseph Smith said, "This was the centre of the earth, the site of the ancient Garden of Eden." But there were sturdy settlers in advance of the saints, who had rights which they were unwilling to surrender to the Mormon prophet. Trouble followed and war ensued, in which the Mormons were defeated. They then moved to Nauvoo, Illinois. Here a beautiful city was built, and here they grew in strength and numbers. Intoxicated with prosperity and popularity the prophet became reckless. With an utter disregard of the rights of others, he appropriated property and wives. Evil reports and quarrels followed. The prophet was arrested again, but the saints secured his release and justification at any cost.

In 1844 Dr. R. D. Foster and Wm. Law, editors of a paper in Nauvoo, openly charged them with having taken Mrs. Foster as a spiritual wife. The city authorities, being under Joseph

Smith's power, punished these gentlemen and destroyed their press and types. A warrant was issued for Smith's arrest, but he resisted the officers. Governor Ford persuaded him and his council to yield their arms and place themselves under the protection of the militia. The prophet and his three associates were conducted to Carthage and lodged in jail for safety. There 5,000 Mormons were in arms and their safety seemed assured. But three days after a company of Missourians, numbering 200 armed and masked men, assaulted the jail and killed the prophet and his brother Hiram Smith and wounded John Taylor. The blood of these so-called martyrs proved, indeed, the seed of the Mormon church. Sympathy for the saints, who claimed to have been persecuted, because they were holy and good men, won them friends in this country and in Europe. The success of Mormonism was assured.

Sidney Rigdon now wanted to be prophet—but Brigham Young assumed the reins of government. He told the saints, that God had called him to the throne, and that, together with his strong will, settled the succession. Rigdon, disappointed in his ambition for leadership, left the church forever.

The conflicts between the Saints and the Gentiles was irrepressible. Brigham Young had not the courage to face it. Accordingly the long journey to the Rocky Mountains was undertaken, which ended at Salt Lake in 1847. There they were within the boundaries of Mexico, safe from the pestering power of the "Babylonist" government of the United States. But much to their chagrin, the fortunes of the Mexican war brought them again under the dominion of the hated government. However, they were beyond the probable reach of civilization, and undisturbed, they have been for 50 years defiantly entrenched in these mountain fastnesses. Here the prophet had things his own way, with none to molest or make afraid. To justify the peculiar habits of the priesthood a pretended revelation, making polygamy a condition of exaltation in the next world, was conveniently received. To give it sacredness and added force it was dated back to 1843 and ascribed to Joseph Smith, the martyr prophet. But the trans-continental travel was increas-

ing, and the isolation of the saints threatened, therefore gentiles must be kept out and apostacy prevented. So the fertile brain of that master of men, Brigham Young, divised the doctrine of "Blood-Atonement." This means, that the only way to save the soul of a gentile or apostate is to shed his blood. The "Reformation" set in. The Mountain Meadow massacre occurred in southern Utah in 1857, when at least 120 gentile emigrants were massacred, and their horses and money confiscated, enriching the church by many thousands of dollars. The massacre in the valley of the Rio Virgin, the murder of the Morrisites, the outrage committed upon the Brassfield boys and the assassination of the Parishes, all show how the doctrine of the "Blood-Atonement" was practically applied to destroy outsiders.

The laying of the foundation of the temple in Salt Lake City, the establishment of the perpetual immigrant fund, the hand-cart expedition across the plains, in which hundreds of enthusiastic, but misguided emigrants perished, the "Order of Enoch" devised by the prophet, which required them to have all things in common, by which the innocent saints were victimized, and the priests enriched, mark this period of Mormon history.

But a better order of things was established under the military arm of the government of the United States. Under governmental protection gentile miners began to develop the great resources of that country. In due time the Union Pacific railroad reached Utah and outside capital and enterprise came in. The hills and valleys began to smile with awakening life. Salt Lake City was changing, civilization came into contact with Mormonism at every point. The day was dawning and the common people rejoiced.

While Utah was a territory the strong hand of the nation was felt. The executive and judicial officers were appointed by the President of the United States, and the acts of the territorial legislatures were subject to the gentile governor's veto and also to the revision of Congress. With the increasing number of gentiles and apostates the country was prospering, but Mormonism was crumbling. It was evident that

Mormonism could not hold its own in comparison and in contact with Christianity. It must live alone and gather its converts from abroad. This was its only hope. It won no converts from its neighbors. And its loss by apostacy was about equal to its gain by immigration, while the power of the priesthood was growing weaker. Something must be done to save the Mormon ship from wreck. By pretending to quit the practice of polygamy, and promising to be good, decent people, and law-abiding citizens they induced Congress to admit Utah into the Union. But as soon as the Mormons got control of the government they forgot their promise, renewed the practice of polygamy and insulted the people of the United States by electing a polygamist to Congress.

ARTICLES OF FAITH.

The articles of Mormon faith are abominable, and some of them shocking to every feeling of Christian refinement. Here are a few of them copied from their own publications and catechism:

"God was once what we are now, and is an exalted man."

"Adam is our forefather and our god, and is the only god with whom we have to do."

"The head god called together the gods, and sat in grand council to bring forth a world."

"Are there more gods than one? Answer: Yes, many."

"When our father Adam came into the garden of Eden he brought Eve, *one of his wives* with him."

"Each god through his wife or wives raises up a numerous family of sons and daughters, for each father and mother will be in condition to multiply forever and ever."

"Jesus Christ and the Father are two persons in the same sense that John and Peter are two persons, possessing every organ, limb and material part that man possesses."

"The purest, most refined and subtile of the substances is that substance called the Holy Ghost."

"There is no other god in heaven, but that god who has flesh and bones."

"These gods are therefore subject to the necessary laws which govern all matter."

"You think our god is not a lively, sociable and cheerful man; he is one of the most lively men that ever lived."

"Question: Was it necessary that Adam should partake of the forbidden fruit? Answer: Yes, unless he had done so, he would not have known good and evil here, neither could he have had mortal posterity."

"Question: Did Adam and Eve lament or rejoice, because they had transgressed the commandment? Answer: They rejoiced and praised god."

"It is a dreadful thing to fight against, or in any manner oppose the priesthood."

Their priesthood gives them the right to advise and instruct the saints, and their priestly jurisdiction extends over all things spiritual and temporal.

"No man need judge me," writes Brigham Young. "You know nothing about it, whether I am sent or not; furthermore, it is none of your business, but only to listen with open ears to what is taught you, and serve God with undivided heart."

They claim that the Bible in its present state is not a perfect guide. "Who knows," say they, "that even one verse of the whole Bible has escaped pollution, so as to convey the same sense now that it did in the original?"

"Willard Woodhoff is a prophet, and I know that he has a great many prophets around him, and he can make scriptures as good as those in the Bible."

Here is a quotation from Brigham Young's paper, the *Desert News:* "We have the *greatest and smartest liars in the world*, the *cunningest and most adroit theives*, and any other shade of character that you can mention. We can pick out elders in Isreal right here, who can beat the world at gambling, who can handle the cards, can cut and shuffle them with the smartest rogue on God's footstool. I can produce elders here who can shave their smartest shavers, and take their money from them. We can beat the world at any game, because we have men here

that *live in the light of the Lord*, that have the holy priesthood and hold the keys of the kingdom of God."

Much more of such abominable doctrines might be quoted from the periodicals and catechism of the Mormons, but I will refer to only one more, one that is shocking to every devout believer in Jesus, and must be regarded as a horrible blasphemy and perversion of Holy Scripture. It charges even the Lord Jesus Christ wlth being an actual polygamist.

Apostle Orson Hyde, president of the twelve apostles, said in a sermon, Oct. 8, 1854:

"If at the marriage of Cana in Galilee Jesus was the bridegroom and took unto him Martha, Mary and the other Mary, whom Jesus loved, it shocks not our nerves. If there was not attachments and familiarity between our Saviour and these women highly improper only in the relation of husband and wife, then we have no sense of propriety. We say it was Jesus Christ who was married, whereby he could *see his seed* before he was crucified. I shall say here that before the Saviour died *he looked upon his own natural children as we look upon ours.* When Mary came to the sepulchre she saw two angels, and they said unto her, 'Woman, why weepest thou? She said unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord or husband." '

METHODS OF MORMON MISSIONARIES.

The Mormons have been increasing very rapidly during the last few years, and it is interesting to know the reasons of their phenomenal growth and the means employed to augment their numerical strength. Mormonism grows neither because of its merits as a system of moral or religious truth, nor alone by appealing to the depravity of human nature.

Mormon missionaries are sent to all parts of the United States of America and to most countries in Europe. When they come into a new community they do not make themselves known for some time. They first spy out the land, and find out all they can about the condition of local church life, who are professing Christians and who are not. As a rule they find little difficulty in proselyting those who are weak in faith, or dis-

satisfied with their church relations. There are generally two of them; they make "a friendly call," and make themselves agreeable and become acquainted. They represent themselves as Christian missionaries who go two and two like the seventy, sent out by the Saviour, without money and without pay. The leader introduces himself very pleasantly and asks your name. Then he introduces his friend Mr. So-and-so, when they will probably say: "We are strangers in this place, but have come to stay, and we want to become acquainted with the people. It is for this purpose that we have called upon you; and we hope that our acquaintance may prove to be mutually beneficial."

If they find you an earnest consecrated Christian, they will see that there is not much hope of converting you to Mormonism. But if they find you dissatisfied in your present church relation, they will ask to what church you belong, and if you name your church connection, they will probably ask, "Do you attend church regularly?" If you reply, "Not very regularly," they will probably ask, "Why not?" If you say, "I don't feel like going all the time," they will likely ask, "Why don't you feel like going all the time?" And if you say, "Because the minister is not eloquent," they will probably say, "well he ought to be eloquent if he is a true embassador of Christ. Indeed, he ought always to speak with the demonstration and power of the Spirit. Who does not so preach proves that he speaks without authority and does not deserve a hearing." Should you answer, "I do not feel like going to church, because there are class distinctions in our congregation which prevent me from feeling at home there," these wily Mormon "elders" will encourage you in this feeling that the fault is with the church, the minister, or some one else than yourself. Perhaps they will say, as they often do, "Well, no one can blame you for not feeling at home in a church where such things exist. We should not feel at home in such a church ourselves. In the Church of Christ all the members are brothers and sisters in Christ Jesus; and one person is just as good as another, no matter whether he has fine clothes or as much money or not." They quote from the Bible such passages as the following: "The rich and the poor meet

together; the Lord is the maker of them all," to prove to you that your church is not in harmony with the Bible, and therefore not a true church. If the "elders" were honest, they would tell you there are greater class distinctions in their "Latter Day Saints" church than in any other.

Probably about this time the "Elders" will put into your hands a tract to show how far the churches of to-day have drifted away from the ancient simplicity which characterized the New Testament Church; or if they have made you feel that you have found in them the best friend you ever had, you will likely ask them, who they are, and they will answer, "We are Christian missionaries. We are here to do all the good we can *free of charge.* We travel without purse or scrip, just as the seventy in the days of Christ. In fact we are the seventies, chosen just as the ancient seventies were, and we are on the same kind of mission they were called to fulfill. If we can give you any advice we shall be glad to do it, but we cannot advise you to continue going to a church or listening to such a minister as you have been telling us about, for they are evidently not truly Christian."

Posssibly by this time they will tell you, that as they are travelling "without purse or scrip," and as the servants of God are depending on the generosity of the people among whom they labor for support, you will feel like inviting them to dine with you, or even to make their home at your house while in your neighborhood.

When they think the proper time has come they will say, "We are missionaries of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints" (thereby misleading all who never heard the Mormon church called by that euphonious name). "We believe in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, the same as all other Christians do," (thereby leaving the impression that they believe in the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, which they do not).

"We believe in the Bible as the Word of God given by divine inspiration" (not intimating that they believe also in their Book of Mormon, which is better adapted to these times than the Bible). "We hold some views which are a little different from the views of other denominations; but we do not ask

any one to believe anything which we cannot prove by this Bible," (holding up the Bible).

In this way they proceed with all the principal doctrines of the Christian Church. The final proposition is their doctrine of the laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, according to Acts 8 : 17, 18. Then they proceed to prove that no one is authorized to administer the ordinances except the Mormon priesthood.

If they can get you to accept this conclusion and join their church they will lead you to believe that God is a polygamist, and that men may become gods by practicing this abomination. They will, morever, by the same methods lead you to accept the Mormon priesthood as the "mouthpiece of God," whom you must "obey in all things temporal and spiritual." They will thus enslave you and make you pay tithes for their support, while they go round pretending to preach "without purse or scrip," in order to get more money out of those whom they are leading astray.

When the Mormon "elders" approach your door or invite you to their meetings, your only safety lies in remembering the words of Christ: "Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves."

PRESENT ASPECTS OF MORMONISM.

As it regards the present aspects of Mormonism, it must be said, that as a condition of admission into statehood they solemnly promised that Polygamy should cease among them; yet since their admission into statehood they have ignored their promise, and polygamy is taught and practiced in Utah, just as it was before. They have even had the audacity to elect one of their leading polygamists, who is now living with three wives, as a member of Congress.

In regard to the present numerical strength of Mormonism and the efforts for its extension the following is reported:

The Mormon Church has maintained more missionaries over the country in the past two years than ever before—about 1700

in all. They have gone into nearly every north-western, eastern and southern state (two of them are operating in the city of York now). Nor have they gone in vain. For it was stated in the annual conference in Salt Lake City last April, that these missionaries the previous year had secured 63,000 converts. They have congregations and centres of influence in many of the eastern and southern cities, and are very industrious in disseminating their mischievous doctrines, sugar-coated with Christian phraseology. Gen. Eaton of Washington, D. C., in his pamphlet, entitled, "The Mormons of To-day," reminds us that the census of 1890 reports 1058 Mormon communicants in Nebraska; 1,106 in Kansas; 1,336 in Wyoming; 1,396 in California; 1,540 in Michigan; 1,762 in Colorado; 5,303 in Iowa; 6,500 in Arizona and 14,972 in Idaho. In Utah the Mormons are about three fifths of the entire population, which is about 280,000.

Mormonism never had so much political power as to-day. It virtually controls Utah, Idaho, Wyoming and Arizona, and in a close election would hold the balance of power in other states, thereby securing in Congress quite a group of men, naturally ready to oppose any legislation which the Mormons might not like.

THE POLITICAL ASPECTS OF MORMONISM.

In the beginning of 1897, the Mormons were about one-half as numerous as the congregationists. During that year, (the last for which we have Mormon statistics) the Congregational churches gained about 12,600, the Presbyterians 17,000, the Methodist Episcopal 19,700, the Mormons 63,000. With a membership only one-fifteenth part as large as these three denominations, the Mormon Church gained some 13,000 more than all of them put together.

They make a great boast of what they intend to do in the future. In 1880 Bishop Sunt said: "Like a grain of mustard seed was the truth planted in Zion; and it is destined to spread through all the world. Our church has been organized only fifty years and yet, behold its wealth and power. This is our

year of Jubilee. We look forward with perfect confidence to the day when we shall hold the reins of the United States government. That is our present temporal aim; after that we expect to control the continent."

From the above it will be seen that Mormonism as a religious system is a conglomeration of nearly all the false religions in the world. It has something of Buddhism, Confucianism, Mohammedanism, Jesuitism, Pharisaism and Materialism, all bound together by the most imposing rites and oath-bound covenants.

In its rise and rapid progress, pretended revelations from heaven, polygamy, blood-thirsty cruelty, political intrigue and aim at universal empire it strongly resembles Mohammedanism, which has been and is yet a curse to the world. God grant in mercy, that Mormonism may not become a similar curse.

ARTICLE VII.

SCHMID'S DOGMATIC.

By Rev. S. Gring Hefelbower, A. M.

In order accurately to estimate the value of this compilation from the teachings of the old dogmaticians we must know the purpose of the author, and in order to know his purpose we must understand his theological environment. For some decades back the fruits of the last century's Rationalism among the laity had been pretty thoroughly undermined by certain powerful preachers and teachers of practical theology, among whom were Pflaum, Krafft, Schubert, Karl von Raumer, Claus Harms, Loehe, Ludwig Harms and Fliedner. And up out of this spiritual soil of a revived church life sprung, as a natural fruitage, a more spiritual theology. Schleiermacher also contributed greatly to this change, for though we cannot accept many things he taught, all, or almost all, agree that he more than any other individual was responsible for the change that swept over Germany during the forepart of this century, a change which meant on the one

hand the overthrow of the worn-out Rationalism of the last century and on the other the preparation for and the actual beginning of the new confessional theology of the middle and latter half of this century, which is not new in the sense that it contradicts the Old Theology, but rather in the sense that the superstructure of a building is newer than the foundation on which it rests.

At the time Schmid compiled his book, there were four theological camps in Germany whose lines of division were sometimes indistinct. First of all there was the almost deserted camp of the 18th century Rationalism, which nevertheless exerted some influence, though, perhaps, chiefly by the remembrance of its former power. Then there was the Monistic Tuebingen School of Baur and his associates which was in its most flourishing and aggressive period. And though Schleiermacher did not found a separate school, there were certain theologians that were closely related to him and are classified by Frank as representatives of a theology that was called forth by his work. Among them were Twesten, Nitzsch, De Wette, Richard Rothe, Hase and Schweitzer. And though they followed him as their leader they all departed from him in certain fundamental principles, in fact Hase and De Wette were somewhat confessional, the former being perhaps best known by his *Hutterus Redivivus* (appeared first in 1828 and has passed through 12 editions), which essays to present the truth as Hutter would have taught it had he lived in the beginning of this century. The other class of theologians, to which Schmid belongs, embraced all those who in their theology turned back to the confessional inheritance of the Church.

After Rationalism had received its death blow, the theology that sprung up was confessionally indifferent. This prevailed even at Erlangen which was then and has ever since been noted for its vigorous confessional Lutheranism. A clergyman who was a student there at this time (*i. e.* 10 or 20 years before Schmid published his book) wrote to a friend:—'There was as yet no confessional consciousness among the devout students, which was not to be expected when you remember the charac-

ter of the times and the condition of theology. And if according to our opinion we were all good Lutherans it must be taken rather in a personal than in a churchly sense, namely, that Luther stood before us as the respected ideal of a German Christian man. We even regarded our honored Krafft (Reformed Prof. of Practical Theology) as a good Lutheran because in the pulpit and in the professor's chair he often referred to Luther's authority and cited suitable passages from his writings.'* Frank characterizes this as "an exact presentation of the condition of affairs." At this time, 1825–1845, such men as Tholuck, Julius Mueller, Hengstenberg, and Dorner were supporting the cause of "Positive Union" even in dogmatics. When Schmid published his book the number of the confessional Lutheran theologians was very small. J. T. Beck represented "Biblical Dogmatics." Philippi with his re-stated old Lutheran dogmatics was but a young professor. Martensen, Thomasius, Kahnis, von Zezschwitz, von Hofmann, Frank and Luthardt were but students or at least were not yet playing the role of leaders. In fact there were not half a dozen thoroughly confessional Lutheran theologians in all Germany. Yet the tendency of the renewed church life was "decidedly toward the period of the Reformation, the palmy days of the Church, and aimed from thence to invigorate itself and to construct *de* novo a mighty edifice."† Many pastors who lacked the necessary equipment for a thorough investigation of the Old Theology were anxious to become better acquainted with it. Schmid wrote his book to satisfy this want, *i. e.*, to help combat Rationalism and the Tuebingen theology, and to direct the strong conservative trend in theology toward confessional Lutheranism and away from Positive Union.

It was the child of the times in which it was written. Conservative theology, especially among the clergy, was seeking the old moorings. It recognized in the systems of the 16th

*Condensed from Frank's "Geschichte und Kritik der neueren Theologie," p. 213, where it is quoted.

†Quoted by C. P. Krauth, Sr., *Evang. Review*, vol. I., from review of book in *Zeitschrift fuer Protestantismus und Kirche*, vol. IX., p. 160.

and 17th centuries the doctrinal inheritance of the Church, yet in receiving that inheritance it felt the freedom of a child. There is no proof whatever that Schmid regarded his book in any other light than that of a means to an end, and that end was the building up of a new confessional Lutheran theology. Yet before the second edition appeared, three and a half years after the first edition, it was claimed by some that Schmid by this compilation from the teachings of the fathers aimed at a mere re-statement of the Old Theology, to the end that this re-stated Old Theology should satisfy all the needs of his time. Concerning the inaccuracy of this assertion and the real purpose of the book as well as his attitude to the Old Theology, we will let the author himself speak: "If, on the other hand, I have in certain quarters been so misunderstood, as though it were my opinion that all that is needed to meet the wants of the present day is the immediate adoption of this Old Theology, I may be allowed to stifle my regret that such an opinion should have been entertained rather than to refute it at length. This misunderstanding cannot have sprung from my own statements, for these express nothing more than a profession of adherence to the doctrines of our Church, and of respect for the intellectual effort displayed in the Old Theology. He who adopts the confession of his Church, however, does not thereby sanction the form of the theological system in which these doctrines are scientifically developed and displayed. If I have therefore not given occasion to this misunderstanding by my own remarks, neither will I be responsible for it. What I have there said [in another publication referred to] will suffice to show that, although I highly esteem, I do not overestimate the old Dogmaticians, with whom I have been engaged, much less suppose that, in consequence of their labors, all further efforts are unnecessary."* Schmid recognized the fact that the times had changed and that new questions confronted the theologians of his day. His purpose was to place the foundation stone and not the cap stone of the theological structure. "Although en-

*Preface to the second German edition found in our second English edition.

tirely different and much larger demands must at the present time be made upon a system of divinity, surely no judicious divine will deny that a most direct reference must be had, in every such system, to the old theology."*

As such the work is purely objective and historical. It is not a work of the 19th century, but a compilation from the works of the theologians of the 16th and 17th centuries made in this century. The contents of the book are too frequently estimated from the title as it is found on the back, and not from that which is found on the title-page of the English edition. And yet the one great characteristic feature of the book is not hinted at on the outside. It is the "verified from the original sources" that tell us what the book really is. The German title is, "Die Dogmatik der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche dargestellt und aus den Quellen belegt," which C. P. Krauth, Sr., translates, "The Dogmatik of the Evan. Lutheran Church Exhibited and Authenticated by References to the Sources." That pure objectivity was the author's purpose is plainly shown by his preface to the second German edition. From it we gather that he considered his book the "republishing of the Old Theology in all its essential features faithfully and somewhat in extenso," and that it was intended "to spread the materials before the reader as completely as possible for his own use."

The reception that awaited the book was just such as was to be expected under the circumstances. The leaders of the detructive schools, no doubt, saw in it the relics of an out-lived system. Many of the Positive Union men condemned it. But there was a vast number who saw and felt the need of just such a work, and among those it was well received. The conservative journals reviewed it favorably and in the short time of three and one half years a second edition was required. In thirty-three years it passed through six editions, and after the author's death, Frank put out a seventh edition in 1893, which proves that the greatest of all the leaders of German confessional Lutheranism of the last twenty-five years thought the

*Ibid.

book had some service to render in the closing decade of this century.

The present estimate in which the book is held by the conservative theologians of Germany can be got from the following extracts from letters from professors representing four of the most conservative universities of Germany. No question whatever can be raised as to the confessional standing of Nœsgen of Rostock and Cremer and Zœckler of Greifswald. Kœstlin belongs to the Prussian Union, yet it seems that nobody thought this interfered with his giving a satisfactory presentation of the theology of Luther. Seeberg also belongs to the Prussian Union, having gone to Berlin a year and a half ago. But while he was at Erlangen he was regarded as a worthy successor of Frank, and since then he was chosen to add a chapter on Frank's theology to Frank's Geschichte und Kritik der neueren Theologie." Kirn of Leipzig was called a "good conservative Lutheran" by Luthardt who suggested him as his own successor. The letters were replies to letters of inquiry in which it was stated that the answers to the questions asked would be published. No other professors were inquired of.

Kœstlin of Halle:—"Schmid's book is thus far the best short representation of the doctrines of our old orthodox dogmaticians up to the beginning of the 18th century, and as such should most certainly be recommended to our students of theology. But it affords no introduction whatever to the most important questions that, since then, have arisen for evangelical theology,—such as: Whether those dogmaticians along with the genuinely biblical and especially Reformational doctrine of salvation did not really, without sufficient criticism, adopt much from the forms of doctrine handed down through the Church? Whether or not they paid sufficient attention to the original biblical declarations? And whether they were just to students in other branches in their relation to the religious biblical truth? In order to be able to pass judgment here a knowledge of the more modern theology, both of the positive and negative tendencies, is necessary."

Zoeckler of Greifswald: "The Lutheran Dogmatik of Schmid

is without doubt a very useful book, which I also generally recommend to the students and candidates when they seek a knowledge of the older Lutheran dogmatic traditions up to the 18th century. But it must be supplemented in reference to the most modern dogmatic developments since the time of the Pietists."

Kirn of Leipzig: "Schmid's Dogmatik of the Lutheran Church is still extensively used by us. I am accustomed to recommend the book to my students most emphatically and sometimes use it as the basis for the exercises in my dogmatic seminar. * * * I am also of the opinion that the student dare not restrict himself to the mere knowledge of the orthodox system, for which, it is true, Schmid's book offers the best introduction."

Cremer of Greifswald: "Schmid's Dogmatik of the Evangelical Lutheran Church is a good compilation from the old Lutheran dogmaticians as far as Hollazius, and is useful for those to whom the old dogmaticians are inaccessable, but nothing more. From one individual old dogmatician we get a much clearer knowledge of their method than from the work of Schmid. From this one learns only the dogmas for which they contended. And this is because the book is a compilation, and not only that, but is a compilation from many other compilations. * * * As historical presentations Schmid and Hase have their individual advantages, and they can render good service only when used as historical presentations."

Seeberg of Berlin: "In reference to Schmid's Dogmatik I would say that so far as I know it is not used as a text-book in any German university. Schmid gives a brief and precise view of the doctrines of the dogmaticians of the 17th century, but nothing more. Naturally in the course of the last century a number of new problems and questions have arisen for which the student finds no solution in Schmid. Therefore, as much as it is to be prized as an historical source, we can by no means use it as a dogmatic text-book."

Nœsgen of Rostock: "In reply to your favor concerning

Schmid's Dogmatik I would say that the book as an independent treatise is not particularly esteemed by any one. It is only a true but ever dry and not convincing report on the dogmatic statements of the 17th century. For even concerning the impelling motive for the arrangement of the different *loci* we receive no information from it, and it is just this that prevents a knowledge of the full worth of the old dogmaticians. But he who wishes to learn to know this and does not care to study Baier, Gerhard, Hollazius and Quenstedt, can do best by studying Schmid."

Luthardt's estimate of the book can, to a certain extent, be inferred from the following facts. In his *Kompendium* the book is merely mentioned as belonging to the first rank of a class of books that aimed at a return to the doctrines of the Church. In the winter Semester of 1895 and 1896, during which Luthardt was compelled to give up lecturing at the university, he gave his students a regular bibliography of doctrinal theology, but neither do the notes taken by Rev. F. H. Knubel, nor those that I myself wrote, mention Schmid's book. If any mention at all was made of the work it was probably so casual that we did not think it worth noting down, and I myself remember nothing of it. During this semester and the preceding one Schmid was not used as a text-book, nor in any of the Seminar exercises of the university.

Another significant fact that could scarcely have been the result of mere chance came to my attention in Erlangen. A student of apparently fair ability and attainments who had studied theology more than three years, two of which he had spent at Erlangen, astonished me by saying that he knew nothing at all about the book, and when shown the title in a catalogue, he merely remembered that he had seen or heard of it at some time or other. However he knew of Schmid and had used certain of his historical works. This student had already passed his first examination.

It will be seen from these statements that most of the leaders of confessional Lutheranism in Germany to-day believe that the book in question can perform a service which, though import-

ant, is limited by the demands of this age. As an historic introduction to conservative doctrinal theology it stands high, but these professors are very careful to state that it is merely an historic introduction and nothing more, and that it is therefore wholely inadequate to meet the needs of our times. Other problems have arisen than those that confronted the old dogmaticians and they cannot be answered with the dogmatic thought and forms of a past century. It is plain that these criticisms are in perfect harmony with Schmid's own estimation of his book, as shown above.

It is also apparent that the use of the book in German universities is not very extensive. The only use that is reported is in connection with the Seminar exercises. Meusel's "Kirchliches Handlexikon," a very conservative publication just appearing, places it third, having put Luthardt's *Kompendium* and Hase's *Hutterus Redivivus* before it in popularity. Even in Erlangen, where Schmid labored, which is one of the three most conservative universities in all Germany, it is possible for a student to stay and pass his first examination without using the book in any way, in fact with barely knowing the title. To express the estimate of the conservative German professors briefly: the book is not at all widely used, and where it is used, it serves merely as an historic introduction, an easy avenue of approach to the Old Theology, which was Schmid's original and expressed purpose.

When it was first translated into English, and for that matter even now, Lutheran theological literature was very scarce. In fact Martensen's work on dogmatics was about the only good authority we had. The Church, laity, clergy and even theological professors, had been anglicized more rapidly than its theology had been translated. And when the agitation concerning this book that had been going on for about thirty years (probably begun by C. P. Krauth, Sr.,) at last resulted in the translation of the entire work by Drs. Hay and Jacobs, many regarded it as a God-send, thinking that at last they had a means of finding out what true Lutheranism means. The doctrinal excitement incident to the formation of the General Council and its assumption of its confessional attitude also helped to prepare a

hearty welcome for any Lutheran literature that might be published in English. The natural result was that the book soon exercised a considerable influence. It was introduced as a text-book into a number of theological seminaries. When anybody not acquainted with German or Latin wanted to look up anything they were simply compelled to consult Schmid. They had no other authority and had scarcely any means of informing themselves thoroughly about other authorities. Necessity made the work a sort of dictionary of theological quotations systematically arranged, from which many drew, and are now drawing their proof passages when preparing doctrinal articles or discussions for the floor of synod. And now, partly because of language, and perhaps partly because of neglect and prejudice against the new confessional theology of Germany, Schmid's compilation from the works of the fathers is by many regarded as a final court of appeal in all things doctrinal. And no doubt Drs. Hay and Jacobs contributed to this end by asserting in their translators' preface to the second English edition that this book can justly claim to be *facile princeps* in the field of theological science of the Lutheran Church.

A striking contrast forces itself upon us here. Our conservative German brethren, who probably outnumber and certainly outshine us, regard the book in quite another and a different light from that in which we regard it. They accord it an important use for a limited purpose, namely, to furnish a convenient presentation of the Old Theology and nothing more. We allow it to exert a most important, if not the chief influence, in moulding our theological thought. In some places it is deemed a fit text-book for theological students. Yet its original and only purpose, as stated by the author and shown above, was to give a foundation for further thought, and not to give form and content to our thinking of to-day.

The conclusion that forces itself upon us here is that one or the other must be wrong. Either the conservative theologians of Germany underestimate the book, or we overestimate it. They insist that it can perform no other service than to offer a convenient way for studying the Old Theology, *i. e.*, we can

gather from it merely one element of a theological education, which, though very important, is nevertheless only one of several elements that constitute a well rounded theological training. On the other hand we give the work a much more important and influential position, and in using it seem to forget that it is the Old Theology of the 17th century, and not the new Lutheran theology of Thomasius, Frank and Luthardt. The conclusion that we cannot escape is, that they use the book as the author intended it should be used, and that in so far as we do not use it in that way we defeat his purpose and thereby really abuse the book. The writer has never seen anything that even hinted that Schmid regarded his book as a doctrinal plumb-line for testing Lutheranism. It is not a final court of appeal for deciding what Lutheranism is. It merely answers the question as to what Lutheranism was. The good and wise men of several hundred years ago, by solving the great problems of their day, did not furnish answers for all the questions their theological successors would be called upon to consider. And to accord them any such authority is to claim that they exercised a sort of infallibility.

The question of the hour is this: Shall we, ignoring all German developments of recent years, accept *in toto* the 17th century dogmatics as the purest and best type of Lutheranism and compel it to give 17th century answers to 19th eentury problems? (If so, let us be consistent and go to Missouri at once). Or shall we, ignoring the work of our brethren of our own generation of the land of Luther, accept this Old Theology, and on it as a basis develop independently an American type of Lutheranism? Or shall we, with our brethren, use this priceless inheritance as a foundation on which to build, appropriating, of course with a critical eye, the truth which they won in this century's conflicts, and thus in fact make ourselves the heirs of all the ages, of the present as well as of the past?

ARTICLE VIII.

THE MORAL CHARACTER OF JESUS.

By Rev. John Tomlinson, A. M.

There are three inexplicable things, namely: (1.) The existence of the material universe. (2.) The introduction of man into this world. (3.) The character of Jesus. The development of Jesus was physical, mental and moral. The intellect was not educated at the expense of the moral powers. The will, conscience, heart and reason, all need development and improvement as well as the intellectual faculties. "It is difficult to predict what the result of our present method of education will be in fifty years. We are training the mind in our public schools, but the moral side in the child's nature is almost entirely neglected. The Roman Catholic Church insists on remedying this manifest evil, but our Protestant Churches seem to ignore it completely. They expect the Sunday School to make good what our public schools have undone, and the consequence is that we overlook a danger as real and as great as any we have to face. Our present generation has received an entirely different moral and religious training; the fruits of our present method will appear later." The character of Jesus was symmetrical and this was its beauty. In the discussion of his moral character many things claim attention, namely,

1. His reverence. This is the spirit of worship. Jesus regarded with reverence the names, titles, character and word of God. He honored and respected the ordinances of religion, and reverenced the Sabbath and the sanctuary. This solemn emotion is the foundation of all religion and moral order. Jesus not only admired God, but he loved him. When he was only twelve years old he accompanied his parents to Jerusalem to attend the Passover. When he arrived in the city he did not go to a tavern or bar-room to play and spree as the prodigal did and *too* many do to-day, but he went right to the temple or synagogue.

He did not creep behind the door or a pillar, or away from the pulpit to sleep, but right up among the teachers and talked with them about the chief points in Christian doctrine, the corruption of human nature and its improvement through the Messiah, and the nature and design of the Passover. He was thus engaged not only for one or two hours, but for several days. He was so delighted in his Father's house that he could not refrain from saying: I *must* be about my Father's business. His love to God was ardent. His prayers were fervent and his estimation of God's word and day inexpressible.

2. His impeccability. We speak of the human, not of the divine nature of the Saviour, of him in his humiliation. Jesus never committed an actual sin. Peter says: He did no sin, 2. Ep. 2 : 22. Neither was he guilty of original sin. Paul says, 2. Cor. 5 : 21., he knew no sin, he felt none. When he was tempted, Mt. 4 : 1–12, he did not sin. He could not sin. He was exempt from the possibility of sin. Fresenius.

He had to be without sin. He had to fulfill the whole law both as to duty and penalty. He had to suffer the punishment of our sins that he might reconcile us to God by a perfect sacrifice, which might avail to all eternity. He has become our *new* head by whom we obtain power to live a holy life. Our standing in the second Adam is not as slippery as in the first. He was to be a perfect pattern of holiness for us to follow. Baumgarten says: He sinned not by omission nor commission, nor was he possibly a sinner, because of the union of the human and divine natures. The sinlessness of Jesus is to be regarded as a consequence of the fact that he was born without moral pollution. He could not yield to temptation. He was the God-Man. The temptation was one of the Saviour's great humiliations. He was tempted for our benefit, that we might be strengthened and comforted in trial. He was a perfect example.

3. His patience. The wiser a man is the more patience he will have. Jesus knew the nature and design of his sufferings. He had an unwavering confidence in his Heavenly Father and acquiesced fully in his will. And, hence, could bear offences and injuries without murmuring and complaining. His gestures,

words and works were all proofs of his patience. It was voluntary, heroic, constant and universal. In life and death he was characterized by marvelous perseverance. He was brought as a lamb to the slaughter and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb so he opened not his mouth. Never was language more descriptive of the most perfect patience—patient as a lamb he stood before his murderers. Even at that dreadful moment when they were nailing him to the cross, when nature whose voice at such a time will be heard, was shuddering and convulsed in the prospect of a speedy and violent death—when his soul was tortured by the assaults of malignant foes and his Father's face hidden from view; even then he possessed his soul in patience to such a degree as to be able to pray for his murderers. The patient sufferer stood with hands fast bound in the midst of his enemies; sinking under the weight of his cross, and lacerated in every part by the thorny rods with which he had been scourged. The savage ferocious soldiers seized with rude violence his sacred body, forcing it down upon the cross, wresting and extending his limbs and with remorseless cruelty, forcing through his hands and feet the ragged spikes which were to fasten him on it, and crucified him. Jewish priests and rulers watch with looks of malicious pleasure the horrid scene and attempt to increase his sufferings by scoffs and horrid blasphemies. Contemplate attentatively the countenance of the wonderful Sufferer, which seems like heaven opening in the midst of hell. And what does it express? It is indeed full of anguish, but it expresses nothing like impatience, resentment and revenge, on the contrary, it beams with pity, benevolence and forgiveness. It corresponds perfectly with the prayer, which, raising his mild imploring eye to heaven, he pours forth to God, saying: Father forgive them, for they know not what they do. This prayer is still instinct with heavenly love and power. Well might St. Paul say: Look unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.

4. His humility. Paul says: Christ Jesus who being in the

form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God. But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. The humility of Jesus was voluntary and sincere. He was not ashamed of the poor and lowly. Born of a poor virgin, the son of a carpenter, he was lowly in spirit. He allowed John the Baptist to baptize him. He associated with publicans and sinners. He washed the feet of his disciples. He willingly suffered all sorts of scorn and contempt. He was numbered among the transgressors. He died between two malefactors as though he were the worst of the three. Surely the way to greatness is through humble service and suffering.

5. His meekness. Meekness is the heart of Jesus. Meekness is a backwardness to provoke others and a backwardness to be provoked by them. The meekness of Jesus was hearty, sincere and impartial. Some are meek toward the strong, but cross to the weak,—meek to friends but savage to enemies. Jesus exhibited this good spirit toward friends and foes. He endured all sorts of injustice. He not only suffered but forgave, died and rose from the dead that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations beginning at Jerusalum. He rendered good for evil. He allowed Judas to eat with him though he knew he had a devil from the beginning. In his threefold office of Prophet, Priest and King, he was meek. The prophet says: He shall not cry nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard on the street. He came not to destroy men's lives but to save them. Hence he himself says: Learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in spirit and ye shall find rest for your souls. Well might the great apostle say: I, Paul, myself, beseech you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ. Pertinently did the Psalmist say: His name shall endure forever. His name shall be continued as long as the sun; and men shall be blessed in him, all nations shall call him blessed.

6. His sympathy. Jesus wept at the grave of Lazarus. He wept over the city of Jerusalem, saying: O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!

As he died for all, so he felt and wept for the sufferings of all. The temporal and eternal calamities of the whole human race, and of every individual among them, all seemed to be collected and laid upon him. He saw at one view the whole mighty aggregate of human guilt and human wretchedness; and his boundless benovelence and compassion made it, by sympathy, all his own. It has been said by philosophers that if any man could see all the misery which is daily felt in the world he would never smile again. No wonder then that Jesus, who saw and felt it all, never smiled, though he often wept.

7. His self-denial. All self-denial is choosing. It is choosing a better thing instead of a poorer one. It is the victory of the superior over the inferior man. In a man that is a Christian the rational triumphs over the animal. It is Gabriel with the dragon underneath that represents self-denial. The dragon has gone under; it is with a great deal of squirming often, but he has gone under, and the angel is on top. Jesus is the most illustrious example of self-denial on record. He being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men. And being found in fashion as a man he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. In regard to his poverty, he himself said: The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head. Well might St. Paul say to the Corinthians: Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich. He became poor in the circumstances of his birth; poor in the circumstances of his life, and poor in the circumstances of his death, that we might be rich in grace and

glory. He sacrificed himself for the redemption of sinful and lost men. What a wonderful Saviour!

8. His benevolence. Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people. And his fame went throughout all Syria, and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken wlth divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them. Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people. God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him. He did good both to the bodies and souls of men. He healed the centurion's servant and the nobleman's son. He healed Peter's wife's mother and the impotent man. He healed the paralytic and forgave him his sins. He restored to sight the blind and cured the deaf and dumb. He cured the dropsy and healed many and divers diseases. He was a benediction to the human race.

9. His zeal. Zeal is the ardor of all the affections, carrying forth a man to the utmost for God's glory and his Church's good. It is not so much an affection as an intense degree of all the affections. The zeal of Jesus ate him up as fire eats up and devours that whereon it lights. The Saviour's zeal ate him up; he forgot everything else, except the glory of God, the honor of his house and the purity of his worship. What was said of Peter, that he was a man made up of all fire; and of St. Paul, in respect of his sufferings, that he was a spark of fire burning in the midst of the sea, may much more truly be said of Jesus, when he was engaged in the work of Church-Reformation, when he was about his Father's work, promoting his glory and propagating his truth. Jesus was zealously affected in every good work. The character of Jesus contains *all* the elements of a noble manhood, but the writer will close his enumeration with

10. His sincerity. No guile was found in his mouth. Jesus spoke what he thought. His heart, mouth and conduct harmonized. He avoided hypocrisy. He praised John the Baptist more when absent than when present. If he had a reprimand to give he did so in presence of the offender and not in his absence. He degraded no man. Wisdom and discretion were combined with his sincerity. He did not confide in *every* man. Many believed in his name when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men; John, 2 : 24. He possessed the wisdom of the serpent and the harmlessness of the dove. In the performance of all his duties both to God and man he was sincere. He never did as Judas did, who betrayed him with a kiss; nor as a clock which strikes one thing and points to another. He never violated truth. What he promised could be depended on. He paid no false compliments to any one; he passed no hypocritical commendations on anybody; he played no tricks on any one. He was sincere both with his friends and foes. He never concealed the truth. His sincerity extended to all duties and virtues, faith, humility, meekness, gentleness, etc.

All men are capable of those excellences. They are moral and human. They consist not in the power, majesty and wisdom of the Deity, but in the voluntary actions of the man Christ Jesus. They have nothing to do with the peculiar constitution of his *person* or the faculties of his divine nature, but all men are commanded to possess and cultivate them. 1 John 2 : 6. We become like Jesus (1.) By meditating on his life and character. (2.) By remembering his commandments. (3.) By receiving the Holy Supper often, and (4) By imitating his excellent example. This can only be done by the assistance of the Holy Spirit.

In conclusion, the end of all education is character. If the result of education be not good character, it is defective. That education which neglects or ignores the moral side of the child, or scholar *is* deficient. Nothing is more important than character. Character will go along into the eternal world. Kindred, money and treasure must be left behind, but character will go

with us into the future life. If it meets the approval of God a gracious reward will follow in heaven: if not a deserved reward in hell, will be the result. Evermore should the character of Jesus be exalted. It is perfect, a model for all time. The man Christ Jesus *must* be alike the root and stalk, blossom and fruit of character that God can approve and crown with honor and glory forever in heaven.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

By Prof. David H. Bauslin, D. D.

The higher critics of the liberalistic school have had the field for some time. They have produced on the lines of the new views a vast amount of literature. Their industry has been something amazing, and has served to commend them to such as cannot share their views or accord a welcome to their numerous hypotheses. It is now becoming manifest that the conservatives, as was the case in the Tuebingen attacks upon the validity of the New Testament writings fifty years ago, have not been idle, and the results of their studies are now beginning to appear in book after book, such as Prof. Green's "Introduction," and in the periodical literature of the churches. *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for January contains three articles by as many pronounced conservative scholars of high standing, and aggregating one hundred and six pages of that publication.

1. The first of these able and timely articles is by the venerable Prof. William P. Dickson, of Scotland. It is an exhaustive and thorough review of Prof. McGiffert's "History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age." It is a thorough and detailed examination of Prof. McGiffert's historical methods. In an article covering fifty-four pages he shows, as it seems to us, beyond dispute, the groundless hypotheses and utterly fallacious historical methods of the much discussed Union Seminary Professor.

Something of the character of Dr. Dickson's searching criticism is given in the conclusion of his article, which we here quote:

"When one looks to the period and the matters handled by Dr. McGiffert, which, in the judgment at least of the Church, have special significance and unique importance, there seems grave reason to take exception to the use of the term 'History' *pure and simple* as covering the wider field which his book embraces. If it presents to us history, we find it in such close association with the writer's own contributions of critical conjecture and speculative guesswork as to seem to the ordinary reader almost inseparably bound up with them. Although the work is not formally called a text-book, its inclusion in the 'International Theological Library' obviously points to its having that character and purpose. If so, why should a poor student entering on his course, or a simple layman in quest of the generally recognized facts, be subjected to the necessity of *disengaging* the 'history' from the matter with which it is mixed up, or, alternatively of accepting, on Dr. McGiffert's authority, much that subsequent inquiry may discover to be gratuitously superinduced, mistaken and misleading? Why should the title not have conveyed some intimation—some note of warning—as to the distinctive *two-fold* character of the book? How much misconception would have been obviated, had Dr. McGiffert designated his book after a manner more truly and fully descriptive of its contents, *e. g.*, 'The history of Christianity in the apostolic age as it has now been conjecturally discovered and reconstructed in accordance with the writer's own canons of judgment?'"

2. The second of these articles is by the accomplished Baptist scholar, Dr. Howard Osgood, whose attainments as a biblical scholar place him in the front rank of such in our day. The title of his contribution to the subject of old Testament study is 'The unerring witness to the Scriptures.' It is an appeal to the Divine Word itself as witnessed to in Christian experience. The gist of Dr. Osgood's article is given in the following:

"Those who thus would renounce the Old Testament and keep

the New are little acquainted with the anti-Biblical writers of all ages, from Porphyry and Celsus to Voltaire and Paine, Kuenen and Wellhausen. Those writers prove to their own satisfaction, with the concurrence of some professed Christians, but against the whole life and testimony of Christ, that the Old Testament is on a low moral plane, and then by precisely parallel reasoning and similar instances they range the New Testament alongside of the Old, and the depreciators of the Old Testament, who would retain the New, are caught in their own pit. The very learned deistical and infidel writers would drive us just where they want us; either the Bible is God's word or it is a fraud. They believe it is a fraud. We know by the experience of our sin, by the experience of salvation by Christ, by a daily life with the Bible, that it is God's word. That is the clearest, deepest, firmest knowledge possible to human brain and heart. It is founded on the experience of the conscious reality of God, who cannot lie, and on the testimony, often repeated, of our Saviour.

"Christ's testimony to the Old Testament is God the Father's testimony spoken through Christ, that by these 'two immutable things in which it is impossible for God to lie, we may have a strong encouragement, who have fled for refuge to lay hold of the hope set before us.' "

3. The third in this series of fine articles is by Prof. B. B Warfield of Princeton Seminary and is entitled "God-inspired Scripture." The author has given us in a keen and thorough manner a re-investigation of the meaning of one of the most important words of the Scriptures, viz., *Θεόπνευστος*. The article is a fine example of literary criticism of the best kind and deserves to be widely read by thoughtful students both of theology and the New Testament. He traces first the meaning of this great word in the few passages of post-Christian Greek in which it occurs. St. Paul's is the first instant of its use. It is found in the fifth book of the Sibylline oracles; in a poem which was formerly attributed to Prokylides, but now known to be of later origin; in the Jewish-Christian *Testament of Abraham*; in the paraphrase of John's Gospel by Nonnus, a poet who lived in Egypt in the fifth century; and of course in the Church

Fathers. In most of these cases the passive sense of the word is certain, and in the others the writer easily proves it. Two instances are brought forward in works attributed to Plutarch and Galen, but really of later origin. Here the passive sense is evident; but Cremer and other scholars contend that the true reading was another word meaning "God-sent." Prof. W. enters into a fine piece of tectual argumentation, which makes it at least probable that the non-Christian writers used "theopneustos" and if so, certainly used it in the passive sense.

In the rest of his article Prof. Warfeld shows that the conception of the Scriptures as "God-breathed" or divinely originated is one in perfect accordance with Hebrew methods of thought and figures of speech, and that it was the prevailing conception both in Jewish and early Christian circles. He states an important truth which believers in the Bible should not forget, when he writes: "Through whatever minor differences may be traceable between the general New Testament conception and treatment of Scripture and that of Philo, it remains a plain matter of fact that no other general view of Scripture than the so-called Philonian is discernable in the New Testament, all of whose writers —as is true of Jesus himself also, according to his reported words—consistently look upon the written words of Scripture as the express utterances of God, owing their origin to his direct spiration and their character to this their divine origin." That is what St. Paul meant by *theopneustos.*

The most noteworthy article in the January number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, is that by Prof. Hugh Scott, D. D., of the Chicago Congregational Seminary. Prof. Scott, it may be recalled by some of our readers, gave the Stone lectures at Princeton Seminary in 1896, under the title, "The Nicene Theology," a book of much value and strength, in which the author shows his close attention as a student to the writings of Thomasius and other Lutheran dogmaticians. He is a pronounced conservative and Calvinist. This article ought to serve as an antidote for that large amount of specious theological speech in our times, that has been associated with the alleged superiority of right

conduct to right belief. We have been assured many times that among other things that will mark the emancipated Church of the future there will be a discarding of doctrine and a making of conduct the all and in all. Upon the man who still maintains anything like a vigorous robustness in his religious beliefs, the latitudinarian now empties his critical Pandora's box and consigns his teachings to the literary and theological limbo by valiantly asserting—"That is mere intellectualism, mere dogmatism." Of course all this is fallacious talk. Prof. Scott's article is an exhaustive examination of the bearings of the Ritschlian theology, now so widely current in Germany and popularized in this country, on personal piety and Christian work. It is made manifest that the weight of proof, adjudged by our Lord's own test of "By their fruits ye shall know them," is decidedly on the side of definiteness in men's religious beliefs. We regret that we can quote but a few excerpts from this timely and strong article.

"The mediating men, who press the immanence of God towards pantheistic positions, *cripple personal religion in at least four directions.* By their impersonal view of God they chill the prayer of petition and thanksgiving. By confusing the personality of God and man, they confuse our hopes of personal immortality, and diminish the encouragements and rewards held out to virtuous living. By making good and evil but different degrees in the development of the one Divine Principle, they blunt our moral sense, and put a kind of passive resignation in place of an active religious life. And by making all human acts part of a divine movement, they deaden man's feeling of responsibility and guilt. 'It claims for all men what Christianity claims for its own elect.'

"In the use of the Church and sacraments, there is only one respect in which the new theology seems to make them of equal value for the religious life with the older teachings; that is, in the great importance ascribed by the school of Ritschl to the Church as the birthplace of the believer. Many beautiful things are said of this home of the soul on earth. But when we inquire how the Church aids men to faith and holy living,

we are met by a cloud of generalities. The Church is made to take the place of the *unio mystica;* and those who grow up within her pale, in a mysterious way become Christians. Instead of personal communion with God in the Church, we are offered a religious 'atmosphere.' Instead of personal conversion in the Church we receive an "impression" of Christ. The devotional meetings which have marked the life of the Church from the apostles down, are denounced as unchristian, and the Church is described as a moral kingdom on the earth. * * *

"It follows, naturally enough, that the devotion, the worship, of such Christianity, will have nothing emotional in it; emotional religion is Pietism or Methodism, and this school has such horror of the 'mystic piety' of these movements that it allows only man's intellect and will to engage in the worship of Almighty God. Confession of sin is little heard of, and there are few requests for particular things, the doctrine of Divine Providence being urged so as to leave not much room for prayer. God loves us all, and can do all things; he will care for us without our telling him what we want. There is little heard, also, in this devotion, of sanctification; I find no reference to the Holy Ghost in Herrmann's book on 'Communion with God.' And, as we have observed already, such things as revivals, prayer-meetings, testifying for Christ, and what we call personal work, are all opposed. The chief defect of this new theology of Divine Providence is that it understands by providence only God's natural government of the universe, his blessings upon the evil and the good, rather than any special care of the righteous. No distinction is made between God as Spirit and the Holy Ghost, the Comforter; hence the testimonium Spiritus Sancti, taking the things of Christ and revealing them to personal experience, and many other tender, special, even supernatural inbreathings of this "mother" manifestation of God, are put out of the place of prayer. The Holy Ghost Kaftan calls 'the working of God in the world,' also the 'principle of a morally new life'; but it is not personal. * * *

"But when we draw nearer to this theology, the shadows cast by its general excellences are so deep that we can scarcely find

the way to our particular duty. We are met everywhere by an indefiniteness like unto that of the radical theologians. Eike, the last and most praised historian of this movement, points out in detail how it is everywhere pervaded by lack of immediateness; of direct relation to God or Christ or moral ideals. And such generalities are the death of prayer and devotion. Herrmann and Kaftan and Harnack, and other disciples of Ritschl in both Europe and America, declare that out of their religious experience certain doctrines of faith have arisen, and that they have the indirect character complained of. But the query at once is suggested, How does it happen that the experience of a thousand times as many other Christians produces doctrines of faith, that prove themselves by their works, which are of a much more direct nature? And how does it happen that these indirect views of doctrine are so similiar to those which arose in the experience of Ritschl himself? Nay, further, how does it happen that doctrines of faith appear in the experience of these disciples bearing a stamp put upon them, not by the faith and religious experience of Ritschl, but by his natural temperament as a man?

One of the high class religious publications of the world is the *Church Quarterly Review*, published in London. It is devoted exclusively to literary reviews of important theological publications, many of which are elaborate treatises on the subjects involved in the publication under review. The work of this *Quarterly* is uniformly of high literary excellence. The January number contains two such treatises from which we desire to make extracts. During the year 1899, Professor Gardner, Literary Doctor, has published what the *Quarterly* calls a "startling book," under the title, "A Brief Examination of the Basis and Origin of Christian Belief." Prof. Gardner has announced his purpose as primarily being neither "constructive" nor "destructive," but rather, "critical." He has tried to present not an "exposition of a ready made creed," or an "attempt to fix some new scheme of doctrine" but "an *exploratio*, a psychologic and historic investigation of the origins of Christianity, partly with a

view to the possibilities of belief among the new surroundings of our times."

Even this Literary Doctor, however, has been obliged to acknowledge that his work is sometimes decidedly "destructive" in its character. The result of his criticism of Christianity would mean unquestionably the destruction of that religion which is the inheritance of the Christian Church.

As an indication of the tendency and end of the new views now widely current in religion, we may quote the conclusion of the *Quarterly Review's* timely criticism:

"It is not perhaps altogether loss that he has plainly expressed unpleasant views which many are content to hide in their minds, and has shown the real tendencies of lines of thought some advocates of which would shrink from the conclusions which he has reached. Yet in summing up our judgment, we must pronounce the book a failure. It is based to a very large extent, as we have already briefly mentioned, on the dualistic Kantean philosophy, which is surely doomed. The author is fundamentally wrong, as we have spent some time in trying to show, as to the need of facts in theology, the place of the New Testament in the Christian system, and the critical methods adopted. His view of religion is, we are firmly convinced, practically useless. It may in some measure avail subjectively for a select intellectual few, while what is needed, and what orthodox Christianity supplies, is a religion for mankind. For any person at all, the substitution of it for the Catholic faith must mean serious loss in the trials of ordinary life, in times of temptation, and in the hour of death. For it blots out all which is most practically helpful to Christian souls. To give one illustration: those who accept it must remove from their prayers all which corresponds to two clauses of the Litany:

"By the mystery of Thy holy Incarnation; by Thy holy Nativity and Circumcision; by Thy Baptism, Fasting and Temptation,

Good Lord, deliver us.

"By Thine Agony and bloody Sweat; by Thy Cross and Passion; by Thy precious Death and Burial; by thy glorious

Resurrection and Ascension; and by the coming of the Holy Ghost,

Good Lord, deliver us.

"'We do not doubt Professor Gardner's sincerity when he says he has not written for those who are still content with traditional Christianity, but only for those 'who regard dogmatic religion in our days as in an unsafe condition.'"

The last volume of the Bampton lectures, that for 1899, is on the delightful subject of "Christian Mysticism" by W. R. Inge of Hertford College, Oxford. The *Church Quarterly Review* pronounces this one of the two most valuable books published during the last twelve months. Mr. Inge's book is decidedly fascinating. We have the book itself together with the review of it here before us. It is a thorough piece of work, well thought out and executed. In the following passages from the peroration of his book, Mr. Inge defines his position as to Christian Mysticism.

"The constructive task which lies before the next century is, if I may say so without presumption, to spiritualize science, as morality and art have already been spiritualized. The vision of God should appear to us as a triple star of truth, beauty and goodness. These are the three objects of all human aspiration; and our hearts will never be at peace till all three alike rest in God. Beauty is the chief mediator between the good and the true; and this is why the great poets have been also prophets. Science at present lags behind; she has not found her God; and to this is largely due the 'unrest of the age.' Much has already been done in the right direction by divines, philosophers, and physicists, and more still, perhaps, by the great poets, who have striven earnestly to see the spiritual back-ground which lies behind the abstractions of materialistic science. * * * In St. John and St. Paul we find all the principles of a sound and sober mysticism; and it is to these 'fresh springs' of spiritual life that we must turn, if the Church is to renew her youth. * * * The principle 'Cuique in sua arte credendum est' applies to those who have been eminent for personal holiness as

much as to the leaders in any other branch of excellence * * * Now it will be found that these men of acknowledged and pre-eminent saintliness agree very closely in what they tell us about God. They tell us that they have arrived gradually at an unshakable conviction, not based on inference, but on immediate experience, that God is a Spirit with whom the human spirit can hold intercourse; that in him meet all that they can imagine of goodness, truth, and beauty; that they can see His foot-prints everywhere in nature, and feel his presence within them as the very life of their life, so that in proportion as they come to themselves they come to him. They tell us that what separates us from him and from happiness is, first, self-seeking in all its forms; and secondly, sensuality in all its forms; that these are the ways of darkness and death, which hide us from the face of God; while the path of the just is like a shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day. * * * It is not claimed that Mysticism, even in its widest sense, is, or ever can be, the whole of Christianity. Every religion must have an institutional as well as a mystical element. * * * Still, at the present time, the greatest need seems to be that we should return to the fundamentals of spiritual religion. We can not shut our eyes to the fact that both the old seats of authority, the infallible Church and the infallible Book, are fiercely assailed, and that our faith needs reinforcements. These can only come from the depths of the religious consciousness itself; and if summoned from thence, they will not be found wanting. The 'impregnable rock' is neither an institution nor a book, but a life of experience."

II.

GERMAN.

By Rev. S. Gring Hefelbower, A. M.

Prof. Seeberg of Berlin wrote two articles in the Jan. and Feb. number of the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* under the title, "On the Threshold of the Nineteenth Century." In them he essays to answer the questions, What have we experienced in

the Church of this century? What has been reached? What has happened? His purpose, however, is not to attempt a narration of all the individual events that make up the history of the Christian Church for this century, but rather to give an account of the "inner course" of its history. We find two epochs of church life in this period. The one stands in close relation to the last century and the other has begun a work that cannot come to a relative conclusion before the twentieth century.

1. The inheritance from the last century was the spirit of "enlightenment" which was the "natural right" of the Middle Ages, whose resolving criticism of the existing order of things in Church, state and society had been restrained by the Reformation. Soon after the beginning of the 18th century it forced its way back again into Germany, and with a bit of conjecture, set aside the "pure doctrines" of Orthodoxy, which because of its iron bands was not dear to any one, and which Pietism had made to appear useless, and Rationalism showed that it was contrary to reason and harmful. But these formulas of the masters of "pure doctrine" possessed a tenacity of life that defied all opposition, and in the second third of this century they drove Rationalism from the field on almost every hand, and are working now in the thought of the overwhelming majority of evangelical Christians.

However, "enlightenment" wrought lasting change in a number of things, such as the consciousness of freedom, responsibility of personality, independence in judging the existing order of things, etc. Rousseau, who gave "enlightenment" its best weapons, was finally the one who instructed the generation that in the name of life and feeling trampled the "reasonable thoughts" of "enlightenment" under foot. The change was rapid and sudden on all sides. Really the history of the first half of this century was determined by the continuous striving to throw back the "enlightenment" of the previous century. It was an age of restoration. "Schleiermacher's new theology, Hegel's philosophy, the system of Goethe, and above all Romantic Poetry and the enthusiasm for life and feeling and history, the alliance of Pietism and Orthodoxy—both coming rapidly to

the front, not as opponents but as allies—the political situation and the ecclesiastico-practical tendencies" were the factors that worked together in uprooting the theories of "enlightenment" in order to put in its place strong thoughts on the realities of life and history. "The theology of the 16th century must be taken up again," just as it is, thought some; as the expression of the idea according to its conception, thought certain others; while still another class thought that it should be "simplified by elimination" and "deepened" by "speculative elements," "as it were smoothed up new." But the powers that overcame "enlightenment" did not bring with them the tendency merely to restore the old. They rather let loose new tendencies. The work of restoration was made up of questions rather than of positive formulas. Life and faith stand out again as positive realities. How shall they be formulated in state and Church? The solution of this problem was the work of the second half of the century. Von Hofmann said that "men were seeking new ways to teach old truth." We can thus characterize the view-points from which we can get an understanding of the course of the development of the Church in this century: "First, the restoration of the old faith over against 'enlightenment' and also the appearance of questions concerning the new forms for theology and Church. Second, the striving after new forms for the old faith and the old Church. How we came to these special question in Church and state and what has been done toward their solution—these are the historical questions that will occupy us in the following pages."

2. At the beginning of this century Rationalism was on the throne, its best days having been numbered, just as a man does not reach the period of highest recognition until those years which we call his "best" are behind him. It was taught in all the universities. The doctrine of the Trinity, Divinity of Christ, original sin, and redemption through the blood of Christ, were regarded as unreasonable notions, therefore not really meant to be taught in the Bible. They claimed to hold to the teachings of Christ but strove "to free his pure ethical teachings from the Rabbinism of Paul and from the later Platonism and Neo-Plato-

nism." The gospel of Christ was essentially identical with the "religion of reason."

3. But there were still some who held to the doctrines of Christ in the old positive way, country pastors, even a consistorium here and there, and certain university professors. The old sermon books, hymn books and prayer books exerted a great influence. The spirit of Pietism also survived. Christian associations were formed throughout all Germany in which Pietism and Orthodoxy were united against a common foe.

4. Schiller with his "æsthetic religion" and Gœthe with his profound sense for the objective and real in contradistinction from the speculative, and Herder and other leaders in the realms of literature and philosophy, also helped the Church in its struggle with Rationalism.

5. In 1799 Schleiermacher published his "Addresses on Religion to the Cultured among its Despisers" which at once caused many important discussions and entered as a ferment into the religious life of the nation. In it he teaches that religion does not consist in knowing or in willing but in feeling. It is an "experience," "a holy instinct," "the feeling of the universal," "the sense of the Eternal." This was something new. A prophet of a deeper faith had arisen. Ten years later he appeared as the reformer of theology, declaring that it was a positive science.

6. Then came the great events of the beginning of the century, the Napoleonic wars, the fall of the old empire, the rise of the national sense, the ruin of the great army, etc. Men felt and knew that God was making history. He was no longer the postulate of the practical reason, but the living Lord. H. Leo wrote: "It was in this time that the worn out clothes of the insipid Rationalism of Germany were torn into rags."

7. But patriotism is no substitute for piety. The great awakening followed in the restoration of the old faith which was felt everywhere.

8. The Catholic Church understood to gather the fruits of the restoration earlier than the Protestant Church. Once priests

formed the Church, but the time demanded laymen who would contend in the literary struggles of the day, and Rome supplied them.

9. Protestant theology was soon occupied with the work of restoration. Claus Harms, who had been influenced by Schleiermacher, published in 1817 his thesis against reason and conscience as the protestant pope of his time, in which he advocated "Old Lutheranism." The effect of this pamphlet can be judged best from the fact that in a very short time there appeared about two hundred replies. In Bavaria the struggle came to an open controversy in 1825. In 1827 Hengstenberg, a young privat-docent of 25, with the active coöperation of many learned men of his day, began a church paper with the avowed purpose of overthrowing Rationism. Gesenius and Wegschneider of Halle were severely arraigned for their loose interpretations of scripture. Tholuck followed Hegel's parting advice and brought a "pereat" to the "Rationalismus Vulgaris" of this institution. Hase of Leipzig in a controversy that lasted three years completely overwhelmed Roehr and finished what Hengstenberg had begun. Rationalism ceased to be the science.

10. In 1817 the Union was established in Prussia for the spiritual welfare of the Church. It was not well received, and force was resorted to in certain instances. At length it changed from a union by absorption to a union by confederation, and thus allowed the genuine development of the individual peculiarities of both confessions.

11. In this period there were a number of phenomena that at the same time marked the downfall of Rationalism and the beginning of a new development. Chief among these was Schleiermacher's "Glaubenslehre" (work on dogmatics) of 1821. It was in the broadest sense of the word an epoch-making work which influenced the dogmatic activity of the entire century. He builds his system by taking as his foundation the personal experience of the pious Christian. "From the real powers of the religious life of the Christian congregation we can learn what religion is and what its content."

12. Kant's influence continued. We notice it in Schleiermacher. But he was soon surpassed by Hegel who gave us the thought of development. Everything real is only a passing step in the development of being. Schelling reversed the process and in his speculation went from God to the world.

13. The theologians of the period chose as their master either Schleiermacher (Twesten, DeWette, Bleek et al.) or Hegel (Marheineke, Rosenkranz). Herder influenced exegesis somewhat. Strauss in his "Life of Jesus" 1835 declared that the stories about Jesus were myths. This book brought before the Church problems on which it has been working a long time. In the same year Vatke of Berlin applied the idea of development to the Old Testament religion and taught that the Monotheism of Javehism of the prophets was a slow development from the worship of objects of nature. The book at first exercised no influence.

14. But the restoration of the old faith soon showed a tendency to take up a theology that had given formulas for the expression of the old faith, and it was thought that this theology was to be found in the 17th century orthodoxy; consequently it was expected that academic theologians should reproduce the same. In turning back to the hymns and devotional works of a former age, it was deemed necessary to take up also the old theology with all its questions and problems, forms and formulas. It was as if there had been no 18th century. The theology of the 17th century was regarded as the normal theology which error is plainly expressed in the title of Schmid's so-called dogmatik. And this idea hindered the free development of theological thought. The glorification of the "fathers" of the Church and their theology as a "sacred dome" was "much less of a blessing to the Church than they thought."

15. The old faith was restored, but new questions had arisen. Schleiermacher, Hegel, Strauss, and the old dogmatics, were incentive, but they called forth many very difficult problems. During the first half of the century Baur is the only man who can be compared with Schleiermacher in importance. His service consisted in raising the questions concerning history of

doctrine, the history of primitive Christianity and the genesis of the canon. "Both worked positively and negatively. But with Schleiermacher the positive overcame the negative, but with Baur it was the opposite. From Schleiermacher we learn both questioning and answering, from Baur often only the former. Therefore a great deal remains from Schleiermacher and little remains from Baur. Schleiermacher is still studied, but how many read Baur's books to-day?"

Thus the first half of the century closes with a number of most important questions awaiting solution.*

It is just a little more than one hundred years since the question of "sources" in Acts was first mooted. However its discussion was very limited until after 1886. Several articles have recently appeared reviewing the various publications from that time to the present.

The question is, did the author of Acts use "sources," *i. e.*, other written accounts of the events he narrates? If so, how did he use them and to what extent did he use them? Can they be distinguished? If so, can we by resolving the book into its component parts reconstruct a history of the oldest Jewish congregation and of the anti-Pauline heathen Christianity? The fact that Luke tells us that he used "sources" in writing the third gospel makes it easy to assume that he did the same in writing Acts. "This guess is made probable by the linguistic peculiarities of the book, which, though it has great uniformity as a whole, shows, nevertheless, noteworthy differences in vocabulary and style, and many unevenesses and dark places in composition. This probability is made unimpeachable certainty by the appearance of the so-called "we" sections, which in spite of their close relation to the whole appear in the midst of their surroundings as membra disjecta." Even conservative men like Noesgen, Zoeckler, K. Schmidt and Zahn, who stand firmly for the literary unity of the book, admit that these parts prove that there were at least written memoranda, of course by the same author, made

*Remainder of this series of articles in next issue.

some time previously, that were used in writing the book. And if we must assume "sources" for the latter part of Acts we certainly must do the same for the fore part, for in it we find plainer traces of such a method of writing. The question is: Can these "sources" be traced?

Bernhard Weiss, in his New Testament Introduction, (1886–'89–'97), brought the question of "sources" into prominence. He teaches that the whole of the second part of Acts is from the pen of Luke and that the irregularities are to be accounted for by assuming that Luke had made notes which he used. For the fore part of the book he assumes a Jewish-Christian written source which was prepared by an eye-witness of the events that he narrates and which can be gotten by eliminating from the text as we have it the additions of the compiler, which parts are easily recognized. Wendt, of Jena, in his editions of Meyer's Commentary, that appeared soon after Weiss' work, was not inclined to go so far as Weiss, but in the last edition of this Commentary he was much less conservative than had been expected.

Feine, in a magazine article that treates of the first half of Acts, traces a source that was used by Luke in his gospel, and postulates another source for chapters 6 and 7. Sorof attempts to win a solution by supposing that Luke wrote an original account which was re-edited by Timothy, The Hollander, Van-Manen, ventures the hypothesis of a final reduction about 125 or 150 A. D., by some one who used an "Acts of Paul" and an "Acts of Peter," which sources had already had a literary history.

In 1891 Spitta made what is perhaps the most valuable contribution to this literature on the "sources" for Acts. He postulates two "sources" that for the most part are parallel and can be distinguished from each other throughout the book. These "sources" differ widely in value and accuracy. "The one was written by a man who stood near to the early development of Christianity, the other was separated from it by quite a period of time. The one was written by a far-seeing man who handled tradition critically. The author of the other source had implicit confidence in tradition. Consequently the one is a reliable historical work, the other is not. J. Weiss accepts this theory, but

applies it very differently. Clemen supposes that there were reductions by men of different tendencies in their attitude toward Jewish Christianity. Hilgenfeld postulates three sources.

These extreme hypotheses have been strongly, and to a great extent successfully, opposed by Noesgen, Ewald, K. Schmidt, Zoeckler, Blass, Zahn, Felten and Belzer. Yet even Zahn acknowledges that several sources must be assumed for Acts, as well as for the Gospel, but he gives most earnest warning that the attempt at separating these sources should not be carried too far, because none as yet have attained to any considerable degree of probability.

A number of critics have been attacking Zahn for what they call "the majestic silence" of his New Testament Introduction in regard to some of the most important problems connected with the Fourth Gospel. Even among certain conservatives there is apparently a feeling of disappointment and regret that he did not discuss the questions more thoroughly. The one which seems to call forth most objection is that of the seeming disagreement between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, as to the time when Jesus became known to his disciples as the Messiah, the Fourth Gospel placing it right in the beginning, and the Synoptics showing no trace of it, in fact giving evidence of ignorance in regard to it, until quite late in his earthly ministry. Recent notices of the book show that Zahn is perfectly consistent in not discussing the question, because he claims that John, instead of following Jesus from the beginning of his ministry, takes us at once to the zenith of the Galilean activity. Thus Zahn finds no contradiction needing explanation. He accounts for the difference between John's gospel and the other three gospels by regarding the expression as a popular designation for the whole seven days celebration.

ARTICLE X.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE ROGER WILLIAMS PRESS, PHILADELPHIA.

Christ in Creation and Ethical Monism. By Augustus Hopkins Strong. President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary, author of "Systematic Theology," "Philosophy of Religion," and "The Great Poets and their Theology." 1899.

Dr. Strong here appears in a new role—as an "Ethical Monist." It does not seem to us, however, that in this he appears at his best. The same vigorous thinker, the same richly freighted mind, the same interesting and suggestive writer is here, but there were inherent and insuperable difficulties in the task essayed which have rendered the chief part of the work, that which gives title to the volume, quite unsatisfactory. It is not to the eminent author's discredit that he has not succeeded, as we believe he has not, in proving the speculative cosmical and theological view he has offered.

The title, we believe, is new. The fundamental philosophy, it is certain, is not new. Under various forms Monism has been exploited in the past and has following in the present, but in its basal contention and formal presentation has always been rejected by Christian theology as irreconcilable with Scripture teaching and the interests of religion and morality. But it here comes to us under adaptive metamorphosis, through use of some great Scripture truths and Biblical phraseology, which gives plausibility to the claim of its being a rejection and supersession of all false Monism by a world-view in harmony with the latest and completest understanding of the teaching of revelation as well as the demands of science. The aim of the author is intensely Christian, and no one can fail to sympathize with his earnest desire to overcome men's intellectual difficulties. It deserves a candid consideration. But nothing is gained by new theories which involve more difficulties than belong to the truths under accepted views.

Dr. Strong fully concedes that all the prevalent forms of monism, whether pantheistic or materialistic, are inconsistent with Christian doctrine and the foundations for the moral life. He, therefore, earnestly disclaims pantheistic character for the view which he presents. What then is this new monism? It is fairest to let his own language state it:

"Let me then sum up my monistic doctrine by saying: There is but one substance—God. The eternal Word, whom in his historic manifestation we call Christ, is the only complete and perfect expression of God. The universe is Christ's finite and temporal manifestation of God.

The universe is not itself God—it is only the partial unfolding of God's wisdom and power, adapted to the comprehension of finite intelligences. It has had a beginning—the world is temporal, while the Word is eternal. * * * This is not pantheism, for pantheism is not simply monism, but monism coupled with two denials, the denial of the personality of God and the denial of the transcendence of God. My doctrine takes the grain of truth in pantheism, namely, its monistic element, while it maintains in opposition to pantheism the personality of God and the personality of man, though it regards the latter as related to the former somewhat as the persons of the Trinity are related to the one all-inclusive divine personality. My doctrine maintains the transcendence of God, though it regards this transcendence as not necessarily out-sidedness in space, but rather inexhaustibleness of resource within, and so conceives of evolution as the common method of God, while it leaves room for supernatural working in incarnation, resurrection, regeneration."

This "personality" and "transcendence" of God are maintained in the interest of the ethical demand. "Ethical Monism recognizes all the truth there is in pantheism, without including any of its errors. It recognizes the all-inclusive life of the universe, while it adds the truths pantheism ignores—God's personality and transcendence." An Ethical Monist is declared to be "a believer that God and man are of one substance, but a hater of pantheism, which denies God's transcendence and separate personality." A proper conception of this monism, however, can be given only by quoting additional definitive statements. Man is spoken of as "of the substance of God." In harmony with the idea in the above given extract, in connection with reminder of the accepted doctrine that *Christ* is "of the substance of God," with a "distinct personality," we are asked: "If in the one substance of God there are three *infinite* personalities, why may there not be in that same substance multitudinous *finite* personalities?" Human "consubstantiality" with God is distinctly a part of the new view. This, certainly, is a novel extension in Christian theology, of the application of the Nicene term "homoousian," "consubstantial." "Depotentiation" into human *finiteness* took place when the race was formed by Christ. "Since he is the only life of humanity, the race began to be, and it continued to be, only by virtue of a kenosis of the Logos." "These finite spirits are circumscriptions of the divine substance." "Nature is the omnipresent Christ, manifesting God to his creatures." Goschel is quoted with approval: "Christ is humanity; we have it; he *is* it entirely; we participate therein." "The universe with all its laws and rationality *is* Christ, just as much as your body, your face, your speech, are you. The attraction of gravitation is only another name for Christ." These various forms of statement, being explanatory and elucidatory, show the positive form of the substantive monism set forth.

As to the *method* of God's producton of the universe thus of his own, and the only, substance, the statements are not absolutely explicit, nor always consistent. But the explanatory terminology is evolutionistic: "It would seem to follow, by logical nececessity, that Christ is the principle of evolution." The statement: "Development, or evolution, is the product of free intelligence," is used to express the conception of "creation." "All things, all persons, all nations, all worlds, are only the partial, temporal graded unfoldings of a Being infinitely greater than they." All this agrees with the author's explicit statement: "I no longer conceive of the successive acts of creation as the bringing into being out of nothing of new substances that are outside of and different from God."

Explanations are given to show how this doctrine may be harmonized with the leading Christian doctrines. The possibility of *sin* is explained in the fact of "*finite personality*," into which "God has limited and circumscribed himself in giving life to finite personalities." Sin is declared to be "the act of the creature." It is said to have been "ordained." "He who ordained sin also ordained an atonement for sin and a way of escape from it." This is explained: "God ordains sin only in the sense of permitting it." Nevertheless it was his own "substance," as self-circumscribed, that sinned. The incarnation and atonement follow this view: "Christ's atonement is not made merely when he becomes incarnate and dies upon the cross. That outward and visible union with humanity which brings him to his sacrificial death is only the culmination and manifestation of a previous union with humanity which was constituted by creation, and which, from the very moment of man's sin, brought suffering to the Son of God." "It is impossible that he who is the natural life of humanity should *not* be responsible for the sin committed by his own members. It is impossible that he should *not* suffer, that he should *not* make reparation, that he should *not* atone. The incarnation and death of Christ are only the outward and temporal exhibition of an eternal fact in the being of God, and of a suffering for sin endured by the pre-incarnate Son of God ever since the fall. * * * Gethsemene and Calvary were concrete presentations of age-long facts: the fact, on the one hand, that holiness must punish sin; and the fact on the other hand, that he who gave his life to man at the beginning must share man's guilt and penalty. * * * The union of Christ with the race by the fact of creation explains not only the necessity of the atonement and its foundation in justice, but it also shows how the work of the great sin-bearer inures to the benefit of the race." The doctrine of the person of Christ is modified: "Christ is not distinguished from men in Scripture by being of a different substance from humanity, but rather by having that substance in its completeness and perfection. * * He is the representative and ideal man, because he is the fully manifested God. Divinity and humanity are not mutually exclusive. * * * We

need now no complicated theory of the two natures and of the union between them. We have at the same time and in the same being complete and sinless humanity combined with suffering and atoning divinity."

Despite the plausibility of this elaborately framed theory of "Ethical Monism," we cannot but regard it as essentially misleading. The claim of Monism is far from assured. Even after the modifications here proposed it is beset with enormous difficulties. How much it stands apart from the natural interpretation of the Scriptures—the distinct clearness of which, when once reached, revolutionized the thought of the ancient world, overthrowing alike its pantheisms and its notion of the eternity of matter, and establishing the doctrine of God's creation of the material of cosmic structure out of nothing as the definite doctrine of Christianity—is witnessed to by the evident *strain* upon Dr. Strong to find any room or support for his theory. One cannot go through the discussion without the constant feeling that the plausibility of the presentation is due to the prevalent use of Scripture phrases and others whose bearing is vague and illusive and whose sense is utterly short of proof or just application to the real point in question—the identity of the *substance* of God and the world—as for example: "Lord, thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations," "In him all things consist," "All things live and move and have their being in God," God is the "ground" all things, "the one and only principle of existence," all things "manifest God." Even the statements that "God is *above* all things, *in* all and *through* all," and that Christ fills "all" things made to do service for the theory, are in their exact thought, not monistic phraseology; for imminence in and through implies difference, not identity of substance.

Dr. Strong legitimately conserves the transcendence of God, and thereby also his personality, by maintaining that God in his free activity in creation has not exhausted his possibilities, and appears to avoid pantheism in the sense that "all things are God." But in making the *mode* of creation simply an energizing of his own substance under the forms of time and space, into all the realities of nature, certainly does not avoid but affirms pantheism in the sense that substantively "God is all" things. This, then, inexorably results in confounding the fundamental distinction, ever maintained by Christian theology between the divine "essence which is called and is God" and the essence which is not divine or God, between Being which is self-existent and eternal and being which originated. But more—the "dualism" of God and nature —which Dr Strong concedes is fundamental in Christian theology, and cannot be given up—is everywhere through the Scriptures presented under forms of conception which imply a distinction too profound and emphatic to be regarded as but two forms or conditions of the same divine essence. And the "dualism" of mind and matter—also to be maintained—is not only too immovably established through the experi-

ence of mankind as a substantive difference, to be believed to be in fact a substantive identity; but the profoundest and most accute investigations of science, whether psychological or physical, have been unable either to find an identity beneath the duality, or to account for all the mental phenomena except upon a recognition of the view that "the mind" is a different essence (substantia) from the "matter" of the brain, and not merely a manifestation of that matter. Moreover, strange incongruities are inevitably developed in every attempt to think through this monistic process—God evolving his own substance into cosmic existence. It may be congruous if the ground and substance of the Absolute Being be conceived of as *impersonal*, to think of its fatalistic evolution into all the forms of the world's existence, provided, of course, that the impersonal energy be supposed to contain the principles of all. But to think of God as a *personal* Being, a spirit essence, freely evolving his own essence or substance, by depotentiation and circumscription, not only into all and each of the finite personalities of humanity, but into all and each of the material bodies or masses which constitute the physical universe, is, it appears to us, to accept incongruities of conception compared with which those, if there be any, of the standard understanding of the Biblical doctrine of absolute creation (*ex nihilo*) are small indeed. Especially so, since the very purpose of this "circumscription" included the bringing of the sphere of sin into the very substance of God, so as to make God himself in the person of Christ the Creator responsible for it. And the "responsibility" (pp. 35–37) being a moral one under the law of righteousness, the atoning suffering in redemption comes to bear the aspect, at least basally and primarily, of a just suffering owed to righteousness by the Creator himself, rather than a pure reality of love for redemption of guilty humanity. Indeed, if we take, in their literal force and fullness, the term "responsibility" and the statement that "he who gave his life to man at the beginning must share man's *guilt* and penalty, (italics ours), the view would seem to be in direct conflict with an element almost universally held to be fundamental to the *possibility* of a real atonement, viz: the absolute *innocence* of the sufferer. These are but hints of the difficulties inherent all through the scheme. Despite our admiration of the high ability of the author and of his loyal aim to serve Christianity, the very outcome of this effort to construct an adequate and consistent theory confirms our long established belief, that no monistic scheme has ever been or ever can be framed that can be legitimately sustained, either before the court of reason, where the realities of the universe are the witnesses, or in the court of Scripture, where the testimonies of revelation are to determine the view.

Besides the three essays which give the title to this volume, it contains a large number of papers, more or less connected with the initial subject, collected mostly from the author's contributions to philosophical and religious journals, together with twelve brief addresses to grad-

uating classes of the Theological Seminary. It was well to embody them in this permanent form. They deal ably with important questions and interests. Viewed as a contribution to the discussion of some of the great problems of our day in philosophy and theology, the volume is richly suggestive and very valuable. M. VALENTINE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Messages of the Later Prophets: By Prof. Sanders, of Yale, and Prof. Kent, of Brown University. $1.25.

This is the second of a series of twelve books known as "The Messages of the Bible." It embraces the prophecies of Obadiah, Isaiah, (second part), Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Joel and Jonah, and treats them in the order here given, which is claimed to be the natural order of time, and is the one generally approved by modern scholarship.

The book is not an ordinary commentary, but is a paraphrase aiming to reproduce in modern English the exact thought of the prophetic writer. Whatever view may be taken of the classification of the various prophets, certain it is that the paraphrase here furnished is a wonderful help in understanding their meaning. Any one who has endeavored to get at the exact sense of these admittedly difficult writings by means of the English Text alone, and who has afterwards availed himself of the help afforded by this paraphrase will be both surprised and delighted to see how much clearer their meaning has become to him. We have made the experiment repeatedly and as a consequence have formed a very high opinion of this little book as an aid to the better understanding of the Holy Scriptures and recommend its use to all who are concerned to know what the prophets have spoken.

The division of the material into sections, with explanatory headings, is another feature which all will appreciate. E. HUBER.

Puritan Preaching in England. Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching, 1899, Yale University. By John Brown, B. A., D. D. $1.50.

In this volume a new turn is given to the Yale Lectures by following a historical, rather than a practical, line of development. In point of time the lectures extend from the efforts made by Charlemagne to encourage preaching to the work and methods of Alexander Maclaren. The term "Puritan" is not always used in its historical sense, as may be seen by the author's reference to Charlemagne, the preaching friars of the Middle Ages and John Colet, of Oxford; but he justifies his use of the word by including in the definition "those preachers who have laid more stress upon Scripture than upon ecclesiastical institutions."

The strict historical discussion of Puritanism begins with the third lecture, on the earlier Puritans, Chaderton, Culverwell, Perkins, Robinson, *et. al.* It is curious to learn how great was their influence on our history. Gov. Winthrop was converted under the preaching of Culver-

well, John Cotton and Robinson under Perkins; and the importance of these three to the political and religious development of the U. S. needs no comment.

The fourth lecture, on the "Cambridge Platonists," discusses a side of Puritanism, of which very little is generally known. It is exceedingly interesting to read of the intellectual importance of Puritanism in the latter part of the seventeenth century. Such names as Whichcote, Cudworth, More, Smith, Patrick and Tillotson are not unknown in theological and philosophical literature. It is instructive, also, to study the attempt and failure of this school "to wed Christianity and philosophy."

The fifth and sixth lectures are character studies respectively of John Bunyan and Richard Baxter. People who have known these men by their writings alone will be surprised to learn how active and thorough they were in the pastoral relation The lecture on Baxter has especial significance for the present. The Kidderminster pastor had strikingly modern views and methods.

Modern Puritanism is represented in the last three lectures by such men as Binney, Spurgeon, R. W. Dale and Alexander Maclaren. In these the historical element gives way to the practical; and Dr. Brown has given a masterly discussion of ministerial activity in his examination of the careers of these men. But it must not be thought that even in the historical lectures the practical element has been overlooked. Throughout there are comments on the work and method of all the periods of Puritanism, and quotations from sermons and treatises on clerical duties.

This volume is by no means the least of those issued on the Beecher foundation. The historical idea introduced by it will add much to the efficiency of the series, if it is continued in future lectures. The abstract principles of homiletics have been so well presented in former volumes of this series that practically nothing remains to be said. But the historical teaching by example can make these principles more real by showing how they have stood the test of time and use, and how similar have been the elements of success for preachers of widely distant ages. Whoever reads this book cannot fail to be benefitted by it, and he will wish for more like it. JULIUS F. SEEBACH.

A Problem in New Testament Criticism The Stone Lectures for 1897–1898. By Melanchthon W. Jacobus, D. D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Hartford Theological Seminary. 12mo. pp. 285.

This is a book of the times and for the times. It could not have been produced ten years ago, and ten years hence much of it will be considered obsolete. That is, the questions it discusses had not loomed into prominence ten years ago, and ten years hence they are likely to to have already assumed different phases from those they now present.

But it is good to have just such a book as this, and to have these questions so ably discussed in the light of the learning and philosophy of to-day.

This book shows that Dr. Jacobus is worthy to stand in the front rank of American students of New Testament Theology, and of New Testament Higher Criticism. The author has a minute and accurate acquaintance with the current literature of his subject, and a clear and phiosophic insight into its logic and philosophy. But his judgment of the teaching of the New Testament is based on independent study of the New Tostament itself. Indeed, we do not think that for a long time we have seen less second-hand learning in a book on any phase of theology.

The one characteristic of the book that impresses us with special force is the thought, developed at considerable length, that the entire problem of the New Testament Higher Criticism, that is, if the New Testament as a record, or as a supposed record and exposition, of a supernatural revelation, "goes back to philosophical lines." p. 22. Hence a solution of the problem must be sought in philosophy, rather than in history. It is the development of this thought that engages the author chiefly in the Introduction of twenty-six pages. He then discusses in order: The Preliminary Profit of the Method; The Problem of the Philosophy; Comparison of the Teachings of Jesus and Paul, pp. 133–229; The Development of Paul's Doctrine of Christian Unity.

The burden of the discussion rests on the "Comparison of the Teachings of Jesus and Paul," and it is here, in our judgment, that the chief strength and value of the book lie. In opposition to Wendt and others, our author insists and, we believe, proves that there is no fundamental difference between the teaching of Jesus, as reported in the Gospels, and the teaching of Paul in his Epistles. Here the main contention is that Christ stands at the beginning of the New Testament revelation, and Paul at its close. From the very nature of the case Christ could only hint at some things, as for instance, at his death, and its significance for redemption. Paul could magnify the fact of Chrtst's death, and could expound its significance from the data given by Christ. Hence "there is no strangeness in the differences between Christ and Paul. They are not differences that throw the Apostle out of doctrinal harmony with his Master. They are not Pharisaical peculiarities arbitrarily thrust athwart the teachings of Christ. In essence Jesus and Paul are at one." p. 176.

It is our judgment that the author, by a strictly inductive method of reasoning, sustains his contention with great force and ability, and in the most satisfactory manner reaches the conclusion that the teachings of the Apostles, Paul included, do not stand "in fatal disadjustment with that of the Master."

We believe the book will be welcomed by all students of New Testa-

ment Theology who have a fondness for the old paths, and who like that strictly scientific method which seeks to solve difficulties, rather than ignore them. The author also inspires confidence in his discussion by making it everywhere apparent that he does not claim to have solved the Problem of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament, but here makes his contribution in the direction of its solution.

J. W. RICHARD.

The Social Meaning of Modern Religious Movements in England. Being the Ely Lectures for 1899. By Thomas C. Hall, D. D. 1900. $1.50.

The size of this work is in no proportion to its worth. This worth arises not only from the great importance of the religious movements it recalls, but especially from the clearness and force with which they are sketched, their connections shown, and their vast significance and lessons are pointed out.

The whole movement dates with the Wesleyan revival at Oxford. It answered to urgent needs in both the religious and social life of the times. Its progress is traced from its High-Church, but pietistic beginnings, through its wonderful extensions of awakened spiritual life and impelling consciousness of the obligations of righteousness in personal, social, communal, and civic. It was by no means a theological or dogmatic movement, but devotional, vitally ethical and practical. One of the notable showings of our author is how grandly, despite theological differences, the spiritual regeneration lifted the *Establishd Church itself* into a higher and diviner power of service in relation to all human interests and well-being, both social and political; so that through the alliance which united in common effort the evangelical party in the establishment, the Methodist schools and chapels and the Nonconformist and Puritan bodies, the total movement became the grandest effective power for victories of social reform—abolition of slavery and the slave-trade, protection of workmen and children from cruelty and wrong in factories, regulation of prisons, extension of suffrage, protection of rights, all the great ameliorations which have marked England's recent advance in freedom and conditions of human welfare. "That the social condition of England to-day is in its best and most lasting features because of the work of the great Evangelical leaders is capable of a demonstration."

Dr. Hall also notes the weaknesses of the movement, especially in its neglect of the doctrinal side of Christianity. In its intense absorption in the development of the Christian life and practical righteousness, it failed to provide needful safe-guard against the on-coming period of historical and Biblical criticism and other conflicts of speculative theology. Its relations to the liberalism of the Broad Church movement, represented in Arnold of Rugby, Hampton, Maurice, and Dean Stanley, and the High Church Oxford movement under Pusey, Newman, Froude,

and others, are traced and interpreted. We cannot agree with all the views of the author. But he has certainly made this book an interesting and instructive story of one of the most profound spiritual and social movements in Christian history, a story that exhibits in panoramic view a beneficent providence which conserved and forwarded the best welfare of the English people, and the interests that are lodged in their progress.

M. VALENTINE.

The Spirit and the Incarnation in the Light of Scripture, Science and Practical Need. By the Rev. W. L. Walker, Laurencekirk, (formerly Glasgow). T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh. 8vo. pp. 388. $3.50.

Inasmuch as the Preface of this book is dated "Congregational Manse," and for other reasons, we conclude that the author is a Congregational pastor. But the book itself deserves to be read both within and without the Congregational Church, because of its intrinsic merit. We can appreciate what the author means when he says that the book "represents much hard labor and not a little dearly bought experience." There is abundant evidence of diligent study of the Scriptures, of wide reading in modern theology and philosophy, and of an earnest search for the truth, such as is born of doubt, rather than of a traditional faith, but such as also persists until doubt is conquered.

The object of the book is two-fold: First, to show that the new and distinctive feature in Christianity is the doctrine of the Spirit; and secondly, that the Incarnation is the culmination of all the divine activity in the world—an ethical process, rather than a physical act, and resulting from God's immanence in the world.

The distinct personality of the Spirit is emphasized, and is made to appear as the predominant quality or characteristic of the Divine essence; though we are surprised to find that the author employs "it," and not "He," in referring to the Holy Spirit. He summarizes the first part of his work by saying "that the Holy Spirit, as the distinctive and abiding Reality in Christianity, is:

"1. The Spirit of God, the very essence of the Divine life, as that Spirit found its full expression or manifestation in the person and life and work of Christ.

"2. While the Spirit of God, and we with that Spirit in all its manifestations and workings, immament and transcendent, it is *distinctively* that Spirit as it comes to us from the whole life and teaching, work and personality of Jesus Christ for our salvation or uplifting into the life of the sons of God.

"3. As such, it is an ethical Spirit of Holy Love, finding its expression in the Truth—above all, in the Truth concerning God in Christ, becoming also within us, as it possesses us, an illuminating, helping, sanctifying, strengthening, and saving Spirit.

"4. As it found its highest expression in the world in the personal

Christ, so it is in Him, as a living, abiding, personal, Divine-human Presence, that it is in its highest personal form with us and within us—at once the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, but coming to us in this Divine-human form through the Son, in whom the Spirit has entered into full possession of our humanity. 'His glorified Humanity is the very home and temple of the Spirit of God' (Dale, *Christian Doctrine*, p. 146)." pp. 90, 91.

The relation of Christ to God is that of eternal Sonship, "an *essential* Sonship and the manifestation of something eternal in God. It is God in that aspect of His Being that may be best described as the Sonship becomes incarnate in Jesus Christ, and Christ had thus, in one side of his nature, not merely an ideal, but a real pre-existence in God." p. 226. This Sonship is based on a real distinction in the Divine nature—on the distinction "between God *in* Christ, and God in his transcendency, or 'the Father,' as Christ stood in conscious relation to him." The distinction made by the author is very acute. It may not do full justice to the reality, either of Fatherhood, or of Sonship. But as conceived by the author the distinction is a real one, is personal.

The Incarnation, which is the manifestation of God, is a gradual process, a continuous entering of God into humanity, very God and very man, "born, growing, suffering, dying," having "a Divine-human consciousness." The Incarnation cannot be accounted for by the theory of *Kenosis*, but must be regarded as the process of God's *self-manifestation* to the world, an *Eternal Kenosis*, not the result of physical processes, but rather of an ethical development through the Spirit—which implies of course that the Eternal Son would have become incarnate, even had there been no sin. Yet his Incarnation, suffering, death and resurrection, serve to deliver humanity from sin.

The doctrine of *the Christian Trinity*—there is an ontological as well as an economic Trinity—is thus presented: "*The Father* is God as the Source of all that is or can be: *the Son* is God as He exists to and for Himself, as He goes out from Himself in obedience to His nature of Perfect Love into the world, to create, and spread abroad the Divine Life and Blessedness in this Sonship realized in finite beings; and as he realizes that Sonship in human form, and returns to Himself and the Divine-human Christ: *the Holy Spirit* is God in His innermost being or essence, the principle of the life of both Father and Son; that in which God, both as Father and as Son, does everything, and in which He comes to us and is in us increasingly through His manifestations." p. 337.

The book taken as a whole presents an effort to restate the doctrine of the Trinity, and to bring it into closer harmony with the accepted principles of modern philosophy and with scientific conclusions. We are far from thinking that the author has perfectly succeeded, nor does he flatter himself with the thought that he has removed all the mysteries

surrounding the doctrine of *the Christian Trinity*. At places he seems to press "the Divine Unity" at the expense of "*the Christian Trinity*." But this is less objectionable, we conceive, than so to press the distinction of persons in the Trinity, as to expose the Trinitarian conception of God to the allegation of being tritheistic. We are not to forget that in treating this profound and mysterious subject of three persons in one Divine Essence, it is hard to steer equally distant from Scylla *and* Charybdis.

While not endorsing all that the book contains, we nevertheless hail it as a valuable contribution to theological science, and as a step conscientiously taken in the direction of a more practical treatment of the doctrine of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. A thoughtful preacher will be able to fashion many of its discussions into material for the pulpit. J. W. RICHARD.

Can I Believe in God the Father? By Wm. Newton Clark, D. D. pp. 215. $1.00.

This little book has already been so widely and deservedly praised that further notice of it seems unnecessary. It takes up the old question of the Being of God and without ignoring or underrating the well known arguments, presents the subject in the light of the modern spirit. In view of our present scientific knowledge and the philosophy of to-day, the author asks, Can I Believe in God the Father? The answer is very strongly affirmative. Dr. Clark shows very plainly that the recent discoveries and theories of science instead of weakening the argument for the existence of God have rather strengthened it. Many of our young men, and especially ministers, in laudable zeal to defend the truth, have hastened to denounce some of the teachings of to-day without understanding them fully. Without going into details Dr. Clark shows how the additions to our knowledge of the laws of the universe make the belief in God more necessary than ever before. Ministers will find this book one of the very best to put into the hands of men who are perplexed by the apparent conflict between the religion they have believed and the conception of the universe they have gained from other sources. It is calculated to strengthen one's faith and to make doubting men breath more freely in a world filled with the spirit of God. They will learn as the author himself says in the last sentence of the book, that "the mightiest moral force in the world is God himself, working for the fulfillment of his own gracious counsel for his human family." D W. WOODS, JR.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

How Much is Left of the Old Doctrines? By Washington Gladden. $1.25.

It has rarely been our pleasure to read a more stimulating, or, in many respects, more satisfactory, little volume than is this last from the

pen or Dr. Gladden. We can say this without by any means approving of all the positions he has taken.

The title would perhaps lead one to expect a radical treatment of the old doctrines; but from beginning to end there is a reverence displayed in the discussion that convinces one, not only that the author is not imbued with the iconoclastic spirit, but that he is a man of genuine faith and rich experience.

The preface opens with a statement that the book is "not for the scholars, but for the people." Right here we would take our first point of issue. What may be a good book for those who are prepared to read it discriminatingly, may be a very dangerous book for those who are not able to discriminate. To use the author's words, there is a very large class of readers "of untrained intellect, who can think of only two statements which can be made about any question, the one of which shall be the exact antithesis of the other," and no amount of guarding and explanation can make them see otherwise. A thing is either "orthodox," conforming to the old established formulas in every particular, or it is "heretical;" and to unsettle their belief in the old statements of truth, is to unsettle their belief in the truth itself. "*How Much is Left*" is a book for those who can *think*, and for no others; but for them it is a helpful and valuable book.

Much of the matter in the earlier chapters, however it may diverge from the old forms of theological statement, has become theological commonplace in these later days, yet however familiar it may be we are gratified to see it so aptly put.

One cannot read these chapters without being impressed anew with the wide distinction which may exist between mere orthodoxy of statement, and the real essence of orthodoxy. A great many present day difficulties lie in a vain endeavor to bnd living thought in the expressions and formulas of the Middle Ages, instead of dressing the essential truth, which the old doctrines embodied, in modern garb. This has been the effort of the author, and it is a satisfaction to see how, in every case, his conclusion plants him squarely on the evangelical basis.

The chapters on the Trinity, The Word Made Flesh, and How Christ Saves Men, leave something to be desired in clearness of expression, yet even in these, what at first seems out of harmony with accepted is more a matter of statement, than of rejection of what is fundamental.

The Sacraments seem to be robbed entirely of special spiritual grace, and in the discussion of the Lord's Supper he repeats the old charge that the Lutheran Church teaches consubstantiation. His final view of this sacrament is practically that of Zwingli.

Through the entire volume there is either a very loose use of the word "Reformed" in referring to the churches, or else, as seems more probable from his failure to notice diverging Lutheran teachings on important points, an unfortunate lack of acquaintance with Lutheran theology.

The theory of the book is consistently evolutionary: and with that as a premise, a strong argument for the immortality of the soul has been constructed.

Taken as a whole, "What is left" is a strong book, admirally adapted to the needs of the thought of the times. It gives a practical, commonsense, yet reverent and devout view of the Christian faith, that will do good among thinking laymen, as well as among clergymen. Its tendency is conservative, rather than otherwise. It is a book to be welcomed.

EDGAR GRIM MILLER.

The Atlantic Monthly for April is an unusually strong number, and it is indeed "Devoted to Literature, Science, Art and Politics." College men will turn to it with interest to read the very bright paper on "The Perplexities of a College President," and they will all with one accord wish that—as is almost without exception the case in the Atlantic—the writer had bravely attached his name to his paper. Politicians will be on the *qui vive* for the second paper on "The Political Horizon." Then the reader who is in search of choice fiction will be charmed with "Maud Evelyn" and "Penny Wise." There are a number of strong papers on such subjects as "The Consular Service of the United States," "The Forests of the Yosemite," "A Comic Chesterfield," "Coöperation in the West," and "A Great Modern Spaniard," "Birds of Passage," "The Childhood of Louis XIII," and "Autobiography of W. J. Stillman." There are some poems that are very beautiful, particularly "An Acadian Easter." The Contributors' Club is devoted to Recollections of Ruskin.

This is such a valuable number that no reader of good literature can afford to do without it.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, NEW YORK.

A History of New Testament Times in Palestine. By Shaler Mathews, Prof. of New Testament History is the University of Chicago. 75 cents.

This volume belongs to a contemplated series of New Testament Hand Books whose aim is stated to be to "present briefly and intelligibly the results of the scientific study of the New Testament. Each volume is to cover its own field and is intended for the general reader as well as for the special student."

This one of the series deals with the period in the history of the Jewish people, which is included between the time of Alexander the Great and the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. Some of the subjects that are discussed in the book are the following: the troubles in the reign of the Seleucidae—the Maccabean struggles for religious freedom—the conquest of Judea by the Romans—the Roman rule in Palestine—the Herodian family—the Messianic Hope and Jesus the Messiah—the Fall of Judea and the rise of the Christian Church.

Any one who has ever undertaken in good earnest to get a thorough understanding of the Four Gospels has found out by experience that a knowledge of the terms in which the events narrated occurred is essential thereto. Just such information is furnished in the book now under consideration—in a clear and comprehensive manner—by a writer whose ability is beyond question. We do not hesitate to express a most favorable judgment concerning the merits of this work and know that its diligent use will help to a better comprehension of the facts in the life of Jesus Christ as given by the four Evangelists. E. HUBER.

O. N. NELSON AND CO., MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

History of the Scandinavians and Successful Scandinavians in the United States. Compiled and Edited by O. N. Nelson. Vols. I and II. Second, Revised Edition. pp. 518 and 280.

The Scandinavians have long been recognized as among our most desirable immigrants. Characterized as they are by industry, frugality, excellent family life, promotion of education, respect for religion, and patriotic devotion to their adopted country, they constitute a class of citizens most helpful to the maintenance of law and order as well as to the material progress of our land. The story of these people is well told in this book, and the reader's good opinion of the Scandinavians will become still better, even though he make due allowance for the fact that the author is giving us the history and portraying the virtues of those to whom he himself is bound by the close ties of kindred and nationality.

Ten years of unremitting labor have been devoted to the preparation of this history, and no effort has been spared to make it trustworthy. Its statistics are very complete and, so far as we can see, thoroughly reliable. Another important feature is its bibliography of Scandinavian-American historical literature, which will be specially acceptable to those making a further study of these people.

The chapter on the "Nationality of Criminal and Insane Persons in the United States," deserves special mention not only for its special interest and value but also for the good showing it makes for the Scandinavians. Of the criminal class they furnish the smallest percentage, and of the insane their percentage is also the smallest with one exception—the Irish. We notice that the Irish have the distinction of furnishing the highest percentage of criminal and the lowest percentage of insane. (pp. 17 and 18 of Vol. II.) This chapter has received high praise from specialists

We are tempted to quote from what is said on the subject of proselyting among these people, especially by the Methodists and Baptists, but we forebear. The waste of money by these denominations to win over these Lutheran people is enormous, to say nothing of their Phariseeism in such work.

We only wish a work of such excellence in contents had been given a more substantial binding. But the reader may possibly excuse this in view of its more important merits. P. M. BIKLE.

LITTLE, BROWN AND CO., BOSTON.

The Puritan as Colonist and Reformer. By Ezra Hoyt Byington. $2.00.

The Puritan as Colonist and Reformer is a delightfully readable book. Its broad margins and clear print attract one before a word is read, while the style of the author, as he tells an interesting story interestingly, holds one from the first page to the last.

The first two hundred pages deal wholly with the Pilgrim and Puritan as Colonists. The influences leading to the settlement of New England, the development of the various colonies, their difficulties and successes, their customs and peculiarities, their relations with the English Crown and with the Indians, and the growth of the idea of freedom are all depected with a fullness and vividness that is both satisfactory and enjoyable

The chapter on John Eliot, the apostle to the Indians, traces a phase of missionary labor too little known, and too little understood. The treatment of Jonathan Edwards, and of the Puritan character, brings to light the brighter and more admirable, and less well known sides, of both, while the harsher and repellant elements of their doctrine and life, though acknowledged and deplored both in fact and consequence, are glossed over by a loving hand.

The portrait of the times, people, motives and doctrines, is painted true to life, but painted from the angle that shows most of the beauties and least of the defects.

The book is admirable as a history, and full of value and suggestion for those who look beyond the mere succession of events for the development of the thoughts and motives that give direction and meaning to those events. EDGAR GRIM MILLER.

GENERAL COUNCIL BOARD OF PUBLICATION, PHILADELPHIA.

Beacon Lights. A Series of Short Sermons. Joseph A. Seiss, D. D., LL. D., L. H. D. pp. 539.

This volume comprises fifty-nine short sermons covering the entire cycle of the Christian year. The sermons have been selected from the author's pulpit ministrations. "They have all been preached, and are here given as preached." They have the charm of a simple and lucid style, voicing the gospel in the plainest, strongest and most direct way; and setting before the mind the fundamental truths of Christianity without the glosses and the rhetorical expedients of special pleading The volume is meant to illustrate the author's conviction "that the supernatural elements in our holy religion, and not its mere ethical teachings,

constitute its characteristic life and only saving power." He has been faithful to his task; and while the author must himself admit that his scope by no means exhausts the rich field of Christian truth, his claim that the pulpit wins its highest dignity in the emphasis given to these elemental truths will readily be granted. The sermons are deeply devotional in cast, enriched by apt quotations from the best hymns. They will fill a place in the home, and add to the author's reputation as a sound gospel preacher. H. C. ALLEMAN.

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD, 1308 ARCH STEET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Infant Baptism, Normal to the Gospel: An Argument. By Rev. H. King, of Somerset, Pa. Price 5 cents in lots, or 10 cents, sample copies. Can also be procured from the author.

We have read with much interest and profit Rev. H. King's booklet on Infant Baptism. It is a work which is orderly in its arrangement, perspicuous in style, logical in argument, and overwhelming in its conclusions. Waiving some points which others have regarded as essential in the discussion, the author at once plunges into the heart of his theme. The exclusion of infants from baptism is illogical. He puts his syllogism in the following form:

The "door" of the fold is open to all the members of the race:
Children are members of the race:
Therefore "the door" is open for children.

If the first proposition of the syllogism can be proved, the conclusion that the door is open for children, will, of course, be a demonstration. But is the door open for all? This is what Jesus Christ, who is the door, has commanded us to preach. To deny this would be to make God a liar, because it would be disbelieving the record which God gave of his son. The race is born without the fall. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Every natural birth must have a spiritual birth to enter the kingdom of God. But if the door is open to all, it must be open at the beginning of every natural life. The proposition is reasonable, because the gospel is equal in scope to the effects of the fall. Here Anabaptists meet the two horns of the dilemma: either children are morally pure and need no regeneration, or they have natural depravity and must be born again. To say that children are morally pure at natural birth and are not in need of regeneration, is contrary to experience and the Scriptures. To say they need regeneration is to admit the proposition that Infant Baptism is normal to the gospel.

It is the position which Drs. Martensen, Dorner, Luthardt and Schaff take in the discussion of Infant Baptism. Children are susceptible to the divine grace, which is offered and found in their baptism. We must all come to this if the race is to start normally in the way of salvation.

P. BERGSTRESSER.

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JULY, 1900.

ARTICLE I.

MATERIALISM.

By Prof. Cyrus Thomas, Ph. D.

The Bible tells us that "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth"; and that God breathed into man "the breath of life and he became a living soul"; it recognizes God as the Creator and Governor of the universe, and an immortal spiritual nature in man.

Materialism, in the sense in which it is herein referred to, denies the doctrine of creation, denies the existence of a God, and also of an immortal soul in man, denies the existence of any spiritual beings. It holds that substance or matter and energy are eternal, and have existed eternally, and that all the changes which have occurred in the universe and which have brought about the present forms and conditions of physical existences, have resulted from the action of energy on matter without the aid or intervention of any power or agency exterior to or distinct therefrom. It holds that even life is from a physical basis, is simply one of the forms of energy or one of the results of the action of energy on substance.

There are other views less radical to which the term "materialistic" is sometimes applied, but our object at present is to present some thoughts on that view which we have outlined above, as we do not believe there can be any substantial halting ground between this extreme view and that which admits a God as the Creator and Ruler of the universe, and an immortal human soul in man; in other words between that view which

sees only the physical universe, and that which adds thereto a spiritual world. We do not believe that any view which does not admit spiritual existence and immortality can meet the wants and yearnings of human nature. Believing this and holding firmly to the Bible and the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion, we propose to present briefly in this paper some reasons for thinking the theory of materialism in the sense outlined above is untenable even on a scientific basis.

As "matter" and "energy" are terms very often used in relation one to the other in this paper, it may be best to explain the meaning herein attached to the latter—the former being used in the ordinary sense of substance. "Energy" is now generally used in the sense heretofore applied to "force" in the expression, "conservation of force," a more limited or special definition now being applied to the latter. The following is the definition recently given by a English physicist: "The trend of physical investigation during the last half-century has been to lead us to regard energy as something distinct from matter, and yet as always associated with it. The conservation or indestructibility of energy induces us to think of it as an entity or physically measurable quantity having an independent claim to recognition along with that which we denominate usually material substance. We have, however, no means of recognizing energy in itself except in so far as it makes its appearance in association with matter as its vehicle." (Fleming). As the supposition that it is an entity is as yet an unproven theory, we shall allude to it as that which changes, modifies, and moves matter, and which is only known by its activity and its operations on substance, or in other words, the working capacity in the universe. Using it in this broad and comprehensive sense, which includes the only power or operating agency recognized by the materialistic theory as defined, we will have no occasion except at one point to allude to those divisions or assumed divisions known as kinetic and potential or latent energy.

As materialism in the sense defined—which is sometimes termed the "mechanical theory"—admits of no Creator, no God, no spiritual existences, no exterior power or agency, and claims

that matter and energy have existed eternally, we will first point out what seems to us to be some of the necessary consequences or results of this theory, some of the legitimate deductions therefrom.

There being, as it asserts, no creating, governing, or controlling intelligence, no guiding or directing power exterior to and distinct from matter and energy, it follows as a necessary conclusion that in the operations of nature, that is of the physical universe, there can be no design or plan, unless the power or ability to design be claimed for matter or energy or the two combined, which would be absurd. Energy, the only operating power, must therefore work blindly, pushing onward always along the lines of least resistence; no design, purpose or plan of operation can guide it; no ultimate end or object can be in view. This conclusion is clearly justified by the premises, and, in fact, unavoidable, without the introduction of an additional factor. If energy cannot design, plan or purpose in the ordinary and usual sense of these terms, then it must of necessity work blindly, and if so, will, according to the recognized laws of force, move (operate) along the lines of least resistance; no other supposition is possible. If there be design or plan it is impossible to think of it except as exterior; matter and energy cannot be supposed to "carry their vocation in themselves, but merely to be means employed and spent in realizing a purpose which lies outside of them" (Hegel). Laws under this theory, except such as necessarily result from the primal nature of matter and energy, can mean nothing more than the temporary (as opposed to eternal) uniformity with which energy operates on matter along certain lines, and can continue only so long as these lines are the directions of least resistance. The only permanent law which can be predicated on this theory, save those which result from the limitations of the nature or mode of being of matter and energy, is the necessity of energy acting along the lines of least resistance.

One of the scientific theories which has been crystalized into an axiom is the so-called conservation of energy;—that it has and always will remain the same in amount, that although

it may assume innumerable forms, and be changed from one into another, the sum always remains the same. Although there are steps in this theory which yet need proof, it may be accepted, so far as our present purpose is concerned. There seems however to be one inference which may be fairly drawn from the knowledge so far gained in regard to it; that is to say, there can never be absolute repose or equilibrium, or in other words a complete cessation of the activity of energy in its entirety, unless that cessation be eternal. Or, to state it in another way, as it cannot be shown that energy is an entity, and is only known in its activity, if that activity ceases throughout, it cannot begin again without the intervention of some exterior agency. It is true that scientists claim that there is such a thing as latent or potential energy, but this is not an actuality, and were all energy in the latent condition it is inconceivable that it could burst into activity without an excitant, which would necessarily be exterior. This proposition seems irrefutable, and if so, must have been applicable throughout the supposed eternal past of matter and energy.

What we believe to be another legitimate deduction from the theory is that the operations of energy on matter as a whole, or on matter pertaining to one celestial system must be cyclical, that is to say, while these operations may, as to variety, extent and duration, be immeasurable to finite computation, they cannot be absolutely infinite in duration, can be eternal only on the supposition of repetition or recurring cycles. The materialistic theory necessarily demands the continued eternal existence of matter and energy, and the continued activity of energy at least in part, otherwise it must be supposed to destroy itself or cease to operate, which is inadmissible. That matter cannot annihilate itself all admit. We therefore hold as necessary to the theory of the eternally continued activity of energy in relation to matter, the further theory that progression will be through great cycles, one the repetition of the other. We are well aware that it is not possible to prove or disprove this proposition; yet taking the results of the most advanced scientific researches which have been generally accepted, and applying them to this theory,

we think they point unmistakably to this conclusion; moreover no other process seems to be conceivable on the materialistic basis.

For example, if we examine the action of energy* on the earth where science has been able to trace the history of forms, we find evidence of a tendency in energy to exhaust itself or run its course in a given direction. This is perhaps best illustrated on a sufficient scale to make the idea clear and the illustration applicable, by reference to the hundreds and thousands of forms, as species, genera, and even classes of plants and animals, which geologists tell us have run their race and ceased to exist. This, it is true, must be conceded on any cosmical theory, but there is an immeasurably wide difference in the bearing it has when we concede an infinite God as the power behind, who moves, controls and guides the forces of nature with a fixed design and an all-comprehensive plan, with a definite end in view. Whether evolution be the method by which he works, or not, it is unnecessary that we inquire at present. If we admit the existence of an all-wise and all-powerful Deity capable of planning a universe and of working out his plans, we can readily admit, though we may not be able to understand fully the how and why, and the processes, that these extinct forms, just as the single sturdy oak ceases to grow, decays and dies, have performed the parts they were designed to play, and that all are steps in working out the great plan. But when all other power except unintelligent, unthinking energy is excluded, and the work performed is without design or plan, these dying forms would seem to be evidence of energy exhausted or of energy having run its course along the given lines. When we see life so abundant and forms so huge in the Mesozoic age die out and cease to exist, it would seem legitimate, looking from the standpoint of materialism, to say

*As gravity, heat, electricity, light, chemical force, etc., are but forms of energy, and life also in this theory, we have throughout this paper, except where making special reference to particular forms, used the general term "energy" to cover all the activities of the universe from that which operates on the atom and molecule to that which operates on the starry system.

that energy, which also brought about the conditions without plan or design and unable to see the result, had pushed to its limits in the given direction. Darwinism tells us that the fittest are those which survive while the others perish; hence these forms of life are to be considered, so to speak, the *rejects*. But this, as a little thought will show, is, after all, only another way of expressing the idea that energy moves along the lines of least resistance.

It is true that this does not prove our position, which we have admitted cannot be demonstrably proved or disproved, but it does indicate a limit to the progress of energy in any one direction. It also indicates, if the theory of evolution be assumed, that on the materialistic basis the upward tendency in the evolution of forms, cannot be eternally maintained, that there must and will be a limit. Here we may stop to ask the materialist on what grounds he bases his theory that progress must be upward. Survival of the fittest only implies being best adapted to the conditions; but it is energy, on his theory, which makes the conditions; therefore we may still ask, on what grounds does he assume that there will be a tendency to produce such conditions as will require an upward progress in life forms? Will he point us to the facts and say: Behold the evidence that the tendency is steadily upward? True enough, but we have no controversy with the facts, the crucial question is, does his theory agree with the facts? It is conceivable on his basis that energy, always pushing along the lines of least resistance, when the limit along one line is reached, may turn in another direction and thus produce a countless variety of forms, but there is nothing in the theory that we can see on which to predicate a doctrine of evolution of forms constantly tending upward, which would seem necessarily to require design or plan. With an infinite God behind it all with a definite plan in view, with power to manage and control both matter and energy according to his own will, and to make the conditions and adapt life thereto, it is easily seen why the tendency should be upward when man was one of the objects of that plan.

Now let us bring forward another illustration which seems to have an important bearing on the point mentioned above. Our reference in this instance is limited to our solar system as a type.

If we go back in the life history of this system to that point which forms the limit of scientific theory, we find, instead of a central sun and the series of encircling planets and satellites, a diffused mass of nebulous matter or glowing gas. In other words the nebular hypothesis which the materialist accepts, and in fact makes the starting point in his theory. Though the backward time to be traveled over to reach this stage may be immeasurably long, yet there still stretches beyond it an eternity. As this nebulous condition could only have been one stage in the progressive changes through action of energy on the matter of the system, it follows that it must have been brought to this condition, if the theory of the materialist be true, from some preceding condition. To assume that this nebulous condition—where energy as heat, or in some other form was holding the mighty mass of matter in a gaseous state—could have remained in equilibrium from eternity to a certain point in the past, and then, without the intervention of any exterior force, commenced that activity which has resulted in the production of the sun and planets and the laws which seem to govern their movements, would be not only inconsistent with the theory, but inconceivable and absurd. As this nebulous condition seems to be accepted by scientists as the most primitive condition of matter (if we may be allowed to use such a term) into massive form to which philosophic thought can reach, the most reasonable solution of the problem—on the materialistic theory—would seem to be that this stage was the beginning of a new great cycle, that it had followed the close of a preceding one. It is true that this can never be more than a theory, but when the materialist has carried us back to this point when nebulosity was the condition, and claims that matter and energy are eternal, we heave the right to ask what preceded? The assumption of cycles seems to me to be the only method by which the materialist can harmonize the different

parts of his theory. Our reason for referring to it is that it seems to be a necessary result of the theory, though not necessarily an argument against it unless the contrary be shown to be correct.

Be this as it may, it seems clear from the evidence to be drawn from the operations of forces in our solar system that there is a tendency toward an end; that there are indications of a conclusion to existing conditions and in this respect an agreement with the Bible. The radiation of heat from the sun must ultimately reduce that orb to a lifeless body and the lack of light and heat must destroy life on the earth; the effect of tides on the movements of the planets and their satellites, and of changes going on in the earth, all point in one direction in this respect. However, whether this will or will not ultimately result in a sudden mighty cataclysmic change of conditions, from which will arise new forms, human science cannot answer; the Bible seems to indicate that something like this will be the result.

Let us next inquire what part that most subtle of all fluids—ether—plays in the materialistic theory. Accepting the wave theory of light it is evident that it extends through space immeasurably beyond the utmost limits of our solar system, as light reaches us from stars whose distance astronomers estimate at more than 100,000 times the diameter of our earth's orbit; a fluid so subtle that it neither piles up nor flows away from the whirling orbs as they travel through space, "which exists in the most perfect vacuum we can produce and cannot be excluded or removed from any place." (Fleming). Materialism can formulate no theory to account for its production or its power of transmitting light, can mark no changes, nor apply thereto the theory of evolution; it can only say that, like space, it is there and was always there, and now admit it as one of their eternal elements—matter, energy, ether, space, time. It is in materialism truly an "imponderable" factor, one they are unable to handle, one they cannot adjust to their system; one as anomalous therein as spirit would be. But now turn to Scripture, to that remarkable record, the first chapter of Genesis, written many centuries before the days of science. There we learn that

God used intermediate agencies in filling the earth with organic life—"And God said let the *earth* bring forth grass" etc., "Let the *waters* bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life and fowl that may fly above the earth", etc., "Let the *earth* bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle", etc., and in the second chapter we are told that "The Lord God formed man [his physical nature] of the *dust* of the ground." As to the process by which he worked it is not our object now to inquire, we merely allude to the fact that he made use of intermediate agencies. Turn back now to the commencement, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form and void; and *darkness* was upon the face of the deep, and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters"; there being no ether, or no wave capacity there could be no light. "And God said *Let there be light;* and there was light." No intermediate agent is employed, but by a simple fiat ether is spread through space, or is then given the power to transmit light. Science in this late stage of the earth's history has just learned of the existence and peculiar qualities of that subtle fluid which seems to be alluded to in those remarkable words "*Let there be light.*" No process is outlined, no agent used, because it required a creative fiat. Materialism can only consider it as an eternal factor, and yet matter, an anomaly to its system.

We turn now to another result of the materialistic idea which seems to involve a contradiction, or perhaps it would be more correct to say an impossibility. According to this theory man is the result of evolution, that is to say, of the operation of energy along a given line; for evolution, on a materialistic basis, can be nothing more than the operation of energy in a particular direction. Now we know that a very large portion of mankind believe in spiritual existences, and in an immortal spiritual nature in themselves. Without entering on a metaphysical examination of belief, it will suffice here to say that it belongs to the realm of thought, and thought in the materialistic theory can be nothing higher than a result of the action of energy on

matter. Here then we have the strange phenomenon of blind, unintelligent energy by its operations on equally unintelligent matter working out and forming beings who look, in thought, entirely beyond the range and scope of the theory into, at least, an imagined world of spiritual existence, factors unknown to and denied by the theory. This involves a contradiction and an impossible assumption, as it assumes that the stream has risen above the fountain, that energy creates or evolves something superior to itself, above, higher than and beyond its own qualities and attributes. Whence comes this thought? Materialism to be true to itself, cannot admit of a single thought in all the range of human existence which has not been worked out by energy in its operations on, or by its relations with matter. To do so would be to admit an outside, an exterior influence, and tumble to the base the structure it has raised. Nevertheless—following the theory—it has produced a Kant, Huxley, and Spencer, who have, or are claimed by its advocates to have, worked out, or at least formulated, the system (!) by which it has wrought the mighty results of the physical universe; and also has produced a thousand others who with equal earnestness deny the theory itself. Which, we may ask, will prove the fitter and survive?

Looking from the standpoint of the materialist, can there in truth be any such thing as progress toward a higher grade, any such things as higher and lower forms of being? Does man in this theory hold a higher position than the blade of grass or the crystal gem? All, looking from this standpoint, are mere forms and conditions of matter produced by the action of energy thereon without design or plan. If there be neither design, plan, or object in view, nothing definite to be accomplished, in what sense is man, the mere result of energy pushing on matter in one direction, higher in the scale of being than the blade of grass or crystal which are also results of the same force pushing in other directions? Will we be told that higher and lower in this respect are terms of comparison based on observation?

That energy, on this theory, in its action on matter is most likely to produce a variety of forms is readily admitted, and that

an outside intelligence looking at these forms and comparing them might assign them to grades in beauty, being, etc., is clearly admissible. But can this view be legitimately predicted in materialism, or by the materialist of one of these forms? Comparison is a mental process, and implies thought and judgment. But thought and judgment in the theory of the materialist are merely the results of the action of energy on matter, or particular kinds of action. Decision as to which is higher and which is lower requires, at least, a theoretical standard; otherwise why not conclude the blade of grass to be a higher form than man; but to assume even a theoretical standard carries us outside of the realm of energy and matter. How then is the idea of a higher and lower form of being to be made consistent with this theory?

There are, however, connected with this thought some questions which go to the very root of the theory. That it is based on the doctrine of evolution is manifest and admitted; in fact it is a theory of evolution. Here the question arises, can there be evolution, especially if its general trend is constantly upward, without design? If not, materialism must abandon its chief feature—the exclusion of external influence.

As it does not claim that life has existed eternally, but admits that it rose at some point in the process of evolution it must necessarily account for its origin. This it has so far found to be a stumbling block that it has been unable to overcome or remove. Although it still claims that this must have occurred in some way consistent with the theory not yet fully explained, its boldest advocates admit that the dictum of natural science, *omne vivum a vivo*, has not been overthrown by proof. However. the insuperable objections to the theory of the physical basis of life have been so repeatedly pointed out that it is unnecessary for us to dwell on them here; the mention therefore of one or two thoughts on this point will suffice.

That it is impossible to define life in the abstract is admitted, it being, like energy, only known in its activity. Spencer defines it as "The continuous adjustment of internal relations to external relations," or "the adaptation between the organic pro-

cesses and processes which environ the organism." But this definition omits from consideration the very factor to be defined. What power, force, or influence is it that "adjusts"? What is it that causes, originates, and governs the "organic processes"? Hamlet is left out. However, as this author in the revised edition of his "Principles of Biology" admits that "the vital principle fails, and the physico-chemical theory also fails; the corollary being that in its ultimate nature life is incomprehensible," we turn to the pure materialistic view which looks upon it as simply a form of energy, or a result of the action of energy on matter; how it was introduced, what was its origin, are questions it cannot answer.

That some other force or agent, or some other form or kind of energy than that which produces the changes in inorganic matter is at work in building up and sustaining living forms, must be admitted. No change or modification of mass forms by the action of energy, that is conceivable to the human mind, could bring about the process of reproduction of like forms, and thereby the continuation for an undefined period of a race of beings specifically alike. This is but one of the many difficulties in the way of the materialistic theory of life.

Returning now to the question: Can there be evolution in an ascending scale without design? We present briefly the following thoughts:

Energy, as we have shown, and as must be admitted, operates, if the theory of materialism be assumed, blindly and along the lines of least resistance. As energy brings about the conditions as well as produces the material forms, and as certain conditions (on the earth) are necessary to life, we must assume that this force fitted up the earth as a suitable abode for living beings. Although this looks very much like design, we pass it for the present with the assumption that it was simply a case where life adapted itself to the conditions, or where, life adapted to the conditions, arose. Hence the character of life on earth is accidental in the sense of being undesigned. But must we assume that it has been simply through an infinite series of happy accidents (undesigned operations) that all the living forms

which this protean energy has built up out of inorganic matter have been limited in their nature to the conditions and characteristics of two kinds—the vegetable and animal? Is there anything in the nature of matter and energy limiting them to these two classes of organic forms? If so, the living beings on the other planets of our solar system must be limited to plants and animals, as the spectrum informs us that the matter composing them is the same, or substantially the same, as that of our earth, moreover this follows from the nebular hypothesis. If not, then it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the operations of energy on matter in forming these two classes of living beings have been in accordance with some design or plan. It may be said that the conditions determine the character of the living forms. Suppose this to be admitted—though energy according to the theory brought about the conditions—how are we to explain without assuming design, that notwithstanding the stupendous changes and modifications of the earth's surface in the past geological ages, and the changes in the living forms, yet not one is known to have existed which is not properly classed in one of the two kingdoms.

The indications of design increase as we find that the myriads of forms of the animal kingdom, those of past geological ages as well as those of the present age, are limited to only some six or seven types, or plans of structure. This, the materialist replies, is very natural; evolution in its work of modification starts from any one point with a form, hence the modifications of that form must bear a greater or less resemblance one to another. Be it so; but the materialist must hold that at least the lower forms of widely different regions were evolved in those regions from the protoplasmic state, and have not all resulted from one or two primary forms of one limited locality. How, then, we ask, has it happened, without design or plan, that all from the various sections can be properly classed in the two kingdoms, and that even the higher animals of Australia are constructed on the same general plan, and properly fall into the same branches or sub-kingdoms, and mostly into the same classes as those of America? How has energy, after out-

lining a vertebrate, managed to grope its way blindly up to four-limbed man without in the long series making a slip and forming a six-legged species? It has in some cases omitted legs altogether, but has never furnished more than four. Is there not someting in the wonderful order maintained in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, with their myriads of species, that savors strongly of design, that indicates plan? The fact that naturalists found themselves compelled to abandon the artificial plan of arrangement and search out a natural one, indicates a strong conviction in the minds of the scientists who have brought the system to such perfection (some among them, strange to say, materialists) that nature worked on a plan. Paley's argument from the watch may be considered antiquated by the materialist, however, it would seem that in this wonderfully systematic arrangement of living forms, there must be some design, some plan in accordance with which nature works. But, by the way, even Paley's watch, according to materialism, was merely a form of matter ground out by blind energy, the maker being merely the medium through which it worked, for to admit that even here was design would be fatal to the theory.

It is unnecessary to our present purpose to pursue this particular subject further here. We may add however that the solution of the problem is to be found in the words of Scripture: "And God said, Let the earth bring forth," "Let the waters bring forth." The how, the process, the various steps, the Scriptures do not make known, these being left for us to search out so far as this may be possible to finite wisdom. This much however seems to be implied, that at the time God gave these commands the principle of organic life was imparted, that then physical nature had a new element of being added to it, or that what from the beginning had been planted potentially was bidden or started into action. Why man should wish to ignore such a power as this, should desire to banish from thought and theory such a God, when acknowledging him furnishes the best explanation of the mighty problem, passeth understanding. Science, true, real genuine science—truth—finds its home, its original seat, in the Divine mind. True science when ascer-

tained will be a statement or record of the steps of God's processes and mode of operation in his dealings with the things of the universe.

As materialism denies to man a spiritual nature, all the phenomena of a mental character are and must necessarily be ascribed by it to the operations of energy on matter; for be it remembered, though the advocates of the theory are confessedly unable to establish by proof the physical basis of life, they admit no other explanation, allow no intrusion of any exterior agency. It does not consider mind an entity, but merely a name applied to the sum of the actions or results of the actions of energy on certain portions of the body, which results are known as sensations, consciousness, thought, etc. It denies the freedom of the will, and in fact the existence of a will in the ordinary sense of that term; and also denies that volition causes or determines action in any instance. Thoughts and feelings are mere accompaniments or results of physical movements, btt never cause of such movements; they are simply the mental equivalents or representations of physical process, but are not causal. Hence my determination or imagined determination to write this paper had no effect on my action in regard thereto, did not cause or influence me to look over works on the subject, think out the plan or any other action in relation thereto; it is merely the result of the action of energy on my physical being, grinding out the thoughts, moving the hand holding the pen, etc., without my will or determination having any part in the matter other than as an accompanying shadow. "The common thought is that in the movements of history, the foundation of states, the founding of families, the activities of invention, commerce, literature, etc., the human mind had manifested itself as controlling. But on the theory in question, all this vast activity has taken place without any intervention of thought whatever," (Bowne), that is to say, did not follow as a consequence of thought.

This conclusion is an absolute necessity of the theory, for to admit that thought or will should be causal in any instance is to admit of freedom of will which emancipates it to that extent

from material necessity and brings in an exterior influence. This quicksand in the theory was clearly seen by Huxley, who, though denying the charge of materialism, attempts to guard it in the following statement: "It may bc assumed then that molecular changes in the brain are the causes of all the states of consciousness of brutes. Is there any evidence that these states of consciousness may, conversely, cause these molecular changes which give rise to muscular motion? I. see no such evidence. * * * It is quite true that to the best of my judgment the argumentation which applies to brutes holds equally good of men." Hence when Mr. Huxley spoke or wrote these words of his "Collected Essays," it was not in consequence of any action of his mind, of any volition on his part, nor was it due to any state of consciousness of his being, but merely the worked out result of the action of energy on his physical nature.

As this part of the subject has been so thoroughly worked over in recent years, it is unnecessary to pursue it further; we will conclude it with a quotation and close after a brief glance at the other side.

"So regarded, the organic changes in brain and nerve become amenable, in principle if not in fact, to that absolute determination and fixity that characterize the ideal operations of exact mechanics. They become distinguishable but inseparable parts of an unbroken and unbreakable mechanism, every element of which is rigorously linked with every other; the whole working in perfect unison, without the possibility of deviation or individual initiative; a world that knows nothing of spontaneity, of quality, of worth, or of purpose; a world in which there is only uniformity of space and time, indestructibility of mass, and persistence of energy." (Ward).

Of all the theories of life devised by man this is the most hopeless, sad and gloomy; even that of the savage who endows the trees and stones with spirits, and looks forward to another hunting ground, is preferable.

Let us turn now for a moment to the Christian theory and see if we can find anything therein more cheering.

Christian philosophy, when broadened to its full and legitimate extent, embraces within its ample boundaries not only the physical universe with its laws, its processes, and its history, so far as these can be clearly determined, but also another universe, a spiritual realm. This philosophy, keeping strictly in line with the truest scientific reasoning, sees in the harmonies of the stellar universe, in the wonderfully systematic growth and order of life forms on the earth, and the adaptation of inorganic conditions thereto, satisfactory evidences of design, proof of some comprehensive plan. Looking beyond the design it sees an omnipotent and all-wise Deity as the designer.

It raises man above the brutes by adding to his physical being a spiritual nature endowed with immortality. It meets the yearnings of his soul by predicating a future life in which he may find, as determined by his earthly life, the full fruition of his hopes. The grave is not to it, as to the materialist, the dark and gloomy cell where human existence ends; the Christian philosophy looks across the gloomy abode to a life beyond, to another world. Its advocates may not be able to solve all the problems which arise, but they are no worse off in this respect than the materialist. With the Christian philosophy the world has some meaning and the human race some importance; in materialism the former is merely a playground for the physical forces, and humanity of no more ultimate importance than the trees of the forest or the soulless brutes. With the Christian philosophy the ego is an entity with a destiny; with materialism it is but a sport of natural forces. The Christian philosophy gives some meaning to love, hope, sympathy, and pity; some reality to religion, faith, and reverence; some significance to history and the activities of human life; all of which according to materialism are but the grists ground out by energy in its operations on matter without design and without being in any way influenced or directed by thought or superior intelligence.

Which is the broader and more comprehensive theory; which the more reasonable, and which best adapted to the wants and yearnings of humanity?

Before closing we desire to add a word in regard to one point which has been a troublesome factor in the Christian faith—to wit, the immortality of the soul. Science as we have seen can find no complete explanation of the cosmos without recognizing an exterior power capable of designing, forming, and governing a universe. This power the Christian recognizes as God who must necessarily be endowed with infinite power and wisdom. Science is unable to account for mental activities and their results without acknowledging an exterior agency—a something that thinks, wills, etc. This agency the Christian recognizes as the soul; but what proof have we, save that found in Revelation, that it is immortal? We suggest that it follows as a necessary consequence if the soul is admitted to be an entity, and that no other conclusion would be consistent with science.

Although the Christian philosopher does not believe with the materialist that matter has existed eternally in the past—as he holds to the doctrine of creation—he does, however, believe with him that it is eternal in its nature as regards its future existence, its annihilation being possible only as the act of the Almighty. Ether, whatever it may be, is also conceded to be eternal in its nature, and will only cease to exist when God wills it. It may also be stated as a general truth that all entities which God calls into existence are eternal in their nature, and will continue to exist until he decrees that this existence shall cease. No other theory is reasonable, except it be supposed that at their creation he implants in their nature a time limit, which is merely another way of saying that he decrees an end to their existence which leaves our proposition without exception. Therefore if the soul be an entity it must necessarily be eternal in its nature. Material *forms*, that is to say, forms built up of material substance, as the tree, the beast of the field, and the human body, die, but entities never, except God terminates their existence. What the soul is in the abstract, or, as psychologists put it, what its "substance" is, we do not know. That it is something as real and as substantial in being as ether, though doubtless far more rarified and etherial, and possibly of

a different nature, may safely be assured. Calling it spirit, though correct, conveys to the mind no idea of its nature or mode of being, as we can form no conception of the nature of spirit in the abstract, we only know it by its activities. But our lack of knowledge in this respect no more affects the reality of its existence than does our lack of knowledge as to what matter and ether in the abstract are, affect their reality. We therefore conclude that soul being an entity must necessarily be eternal in its nature; the burden of proof falls on those who would contradict the theory.

The how, the process by which God brings individual souls into existence, is something that human wisdom is as yet unable to answer; neither can it tell the process by which life was introduced into the world.

ARTICLE II.

BIBLICAL QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THEIR RELATION TO INSPIRATION.

By Rev. M. Coover, A. M.

The manner in which the New Testament writers used the Old Testament in their compositions is significant in relation to modern ideas and theories of inspiration. In this age of criticism every phase of biblical structure must undergo acute historical inspection. Old theories suffer partial disintegration because of the impossibility of adapting them to new relations and facts which come into view. The study reverently given to the Bible as literature has brought out facts which old theories are not always able to account for. The examination of quotations from the Old Testament found in the New has a significance in relation to the subject of inspiration.

There are four books of the Old Testament not quoted from in the New: Ezra, Esther, Nehemiah, and Obadiah. Four others are merely alluded to: Jonah, Judges, Lamentations, and Song of Songs. Ten books of the New Testament contain no direct quotations from the Old Testament.

The number of quotations found has been estimated at about 280, the freedom of citing making it impossible always to tell whether simply an allusion, or a quotation is meant.

From what form of the Old Testament did the writers in the New draw their citations, and what gave rise to the different wordings of the same quotations when cited by different evangelists and apostles?

In the apostolic age there were in existence three forms of Old Testament Scriptures; the Hebrew, the Greek Septaugint, and an oral Aramaic paraphrase used in the synagogue. The Hebrew had ceased to be spoken as a living language in Palestine a hundred years before the composition of the New Testament. Jesus and his disciples spoke Aramaic; and even Paul, possessed of Rabbinical learning, used not the Hebrew, but the Septaugint as the source of his citations. Hebrew had ceased to be the spoken language of the Jews in Alexandria before the third century B. C., which created the necessity for a Greek version of the Holy Scriptures. The Aramaic version arose in Palestine from the same reason, the Hebrew ceasing to be the living language. But the Palestinian Jews were averse to a too common use of their Scriptures, and for many years suffered only an oral rendering to be made to the people by authorized teachers in the synagogue.

The first relatively complete Targum is that of Onkelos, 150 A. D., which was followed a century later by the Targum of Jonathan.* The Aramaic dialect was so terse, so free from redundancy and superfluous terms, that its renderings were quite accurate. The Septaugint differs very materially in many places from the Hebrew, though the Greek text subsequent to translation was kept and copied with greatest care. The cor-

*The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan, so called, are the result of years of growth. There are at present ten known Targums paraphrasing portions of the Old Testament. According to tradition the book of Job was in written Aramaic paraphrase before 70 A. D. It is probable that other books of the Hagiographa as well as the Pentateuch and the Prophets were thus treated at this early date. But these written paraphrases by reason of Rabbinical feeling and sentiment were very rare, and for private and not public use.

ruptions of the text due to copyists were very few, and where there is a divergence from the Hebrew text in the Greek translation, with but few exceptions, the coherency in the subject and the pertinency of the language indicate not corruptions of the Greek text, but purposeful deviations made by the Septaugint translators. There is no extant autograph Septaugint, any more than an extant gospel or epistle in autogragh.

But the known Septaugint manuscripts are of the same age as the New Testament manuscripts.

Three of the chief Uncial manuscripts, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and Alexandrinus, contain the greater part of the Septaugint in connection with the New Testament text. The Vaticanus which possesses the most valuable Septaugint text lacks the first forty-six chapters of Genesis, and thirty-three of the Psalms. This manuscript, dating from about 350 A. D., most probably differs but little from the Septaugint autograph. Few copies were made in the apostolic age, and doctrinal changes and scribal errors were at a minimum. The Septaugint of to-day as found in Codex Vaticanus is practically the same as that from which the apostles and evangelists quoted. Matthew, from the manner of quoting, seems to have drawn his citations from the Aramaic. He quotes largely from the prophets and Psalms to convince his countrymen of the Messiahship of Jesus. Mark has but several quotations from the Old Testament. He writes to a gentile people for whom citations from Hebrew Scriptures would add but little force to the gospel he would present. Luke and Paul in their citations agree more fully with the Septaugint text. John being more concerned with his subject than with accuracy of citation uses the Old Testament not verbally, but freely, while Paul even goes so far as to modify the text quoted to establish his argument.

In examination of the accuracy of quotations very considerable divergencies from the original are found. The statistics given by Turpie are sufficiently accurate for illustration. From the number of 275 quotations 175 are found to differ from both Hebrew and Septaugint. 76 differ from the Hebrew and Greek Septaugint where these two agree with each other, and 99 differ

in all three texts, Hebrew, Septaugint, and New Testament Greek. 10 agree with the Hebrew against the Septaugint, and 37 agree with the Septaugint against the Hebrew, while but 53 are in perfect agreement in all three texts.

There being, most probably, no written paraphrase in the Aramaic yet in general use in apostolic times, free citations from memory of oral renderings in the Aramaic translated into the Greek of the New Testament text gave rise to numerous variation. Differences in the text arose also from abridgment and expansion of the quotations employed. The use of Isaiah VI: 9, 10 is an example of abridgment and condensation. The Hebrew text reads: "And he said, Go and say to this people, Hear indeed, but do not understand, see indeed, but do not know. Make this people's heart gross, and their ears dull, and their eyes dim, lest they see with their eyes and hear with their ears and their heart understand, and they turn and be healed." Septaugint text: "Hearing ye shall hear and not at all understand, and seeing ye shall see, and shall not at all perceive, for this people's heart has become gross, and they have heard heavily with their ears, and have closed their eyes, lest perchance they see with their eyes and hear with their ears and understand with their heart and turn, and I heal them." Luke 8 : 10 makes the freest abridgment: "That seeing they may not see, and hearing they may not understand." Mark 4 : 12 says: "That seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them." John in his gospel, 12 : 40, quotes the passage thus: "He hath blinded their eyes, and he hardened their heart; lest they should see with their eyes, and perceive with their heart, and should turn, and I should heal them." Paul quotes as follows from Isaiah 28 : 11, 12, which in the Hebrew: "For with stammering lips and with another tongue will he speak to this people; to whom he said, This is the rest, give ye rest to him that is weary; and this is the refreshing; yet they would not hear." The Septaugint reads: "By reason of contemptuous words of lips, by means of another tongue, because they will speak to this people, saying, This is

the rest to him who is hungry, and this is the ruin, and they would not hear." I Cor. 14 : 21 : "In the law it is written, By men of strange tongues and by the lips of strangers will I speak unto this people; and not even thus will they hear me, saith the Lord." Another forcible example is found in Isaiah 28 : 16, in combination with 8 : 14, quoted in free language by Paul as one consecutive text in Rom. 9 : 33, and also by Peter, 1st Epistle II : 6. These examples are not mere allusions made by the New Testament writers, but are prefaced by, "Even as it is written," and "Thus saith the Lord." John's free use of Old Testament Scriptures grows out of his spiritualizing and two-fold application of sayings and events. He cites Zech. 12 : 10 in his gospel, 19 : 37 : "And again another scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced." The Hebrew reads: "And they shall look unto me whom they have pierced," and the Septaugint, "They shall look to me because they mocked." He records the saying of Jesus (gospel 7 : 38), "He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." No satisfactory source of this quotation has yet been found. Matthew also quotes a saying (2 : 23): "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, that he should be called a Nazarine." No such verbal statement can be discovered in the writings of the prophets. Of the quotations, about forty in number, found in the gospel by Matthew, two-thirds are the recorded citations of Jesus, who is made to quote the Old Testament with the same freedom manifested by the New Testament synoptical writers. Principles of truth were the important thing to them rather than the *ipsissima verba* of venerable and sacred records.

While the Jews of the Apostolic Age were most jealous of their sacred manuscripts, they were not so zealous for accuracy of verbal statement as for the inviolate permanency of great truths and principles. Verbal inspiration with its modern content was not the sense in which the Jews viewed the divine giving of their sacred records. The cathedral is a quotation from the quarry and the forest. But what a superior modification the

primitive materials have undergone. The quotation from the forest which the savage makes in constructing his leafy hut does not vary much from the original. But the finer mind of the civilized man makes improvement on the original and gives it added value in the erection of cathedral or palace. The Holy Spirit who indited the truth in presenting it to the minds of the Old Testament writers, is the same Holy Spirit who directed the minds of the New Testament writers in the use of quotations from the Old. As minds and souls grow in sprirituality from generation to generation, the Spririt can modify his diction to suit finer susceptibilities and satisfy new discernments. As the mind of the civilized man is finer than that of the savage, and becomes manifest in the use of quotation from forest and quarry, the quotations will differ in form and beauty, but are still designed for the same purpose, to shelter and save humanity. The Holy Spirit uses the finer minds of a new and advanced dispensation, and the product of diction and verbal form may differ from that of an older dispensation, but the purpose and the truth remain unchanged. The divine author is the same. He uses improved material to construct the body of Christ, which is the Church of God. Some few regard inspiration as cosmic emotion or the exuberant overflow of literary enthusiasm. But whether inspiration be regarded as the power of human genius in literary composition, the flashes and penetrations of the mind of the good thinker, or the power which effaces the writer's whole personality and uses man as a mere oracle to speak, or pen to record with obsolute inerrance, truth from God, it is in both extremes commonly accepted as God-given. Whether it be much of man and little of God, or little of man and much of God, or whether it be God Himself attaining con sciousness in man and expressing through him revelations of truth, it is still deemed God-given. Apart from agnosticism the source is but little disputed. It is its nature and degree which become themes of controversy and beget many theories. While the foundations of the Bible records are being so shaken by historical research, the subject of inspiration hangs in the air and refuses to be caged by the net-work of medieval orthodoxy.

We are going back to Luther, beginning where he left off. When Luther left his work his followers at various points left him. They closed the door to historical criticism and research and began the formulation of dogma basing their structure on but part of Luther's work. Luther formulated no inspiration theory. He was too much engrossed with questions of canonicity and tradition, with the authority of the Church and free investigation. Until these were settled in his mind the nature and method of inspiration did not present themselves as subjects for essential elaboration. He felt something of a difference in his treatment of the Scriptures between the Bible as the record of a divine revelation, and as the word of God. When he makes a difference in the value of Biblical books, and especially in the value of writings treating of the same subject, he necessarily recognizes degrees of inspiration in the writers. To his mind the Holy Spirit led some writers more inerrantly than others. With his gradations of value the term, plenary, expressing equal inspiration of all parts is incompatible. Plenary stands in opposition to partial and excludes degrees of inspiration.

Luther did not assume for special treatment the relation of God to the composition of the Scriptures, but his free yet reverent historical method shows the direction of his mind.

The matter resolves itself into this question: How can thoughts from the divine mind reach man, and how can man reach them? How can they be apprehended inerrantly, and how recorded accurately so as to lose none of their truth? A double preparation is necessary. Truth must be humanized, and man spiritualized. The truth objectively given is revelation. The mind prepared intuitively to apprehend and accurately to record that truth is inspiration. The object of revelation is the communication of divine truth. The object of inspiration is the capacious reception and accurate transmission of that truth. The effect of revelation is knowledge. The effect of inspiration is relative freedom from error. There is natural revelation objectively given, written on the face of

nature, and between the lines of events, such as cosmic existences and conservation, and the providential order of the world. There is natural revelation subjectively given, as conscience, God in some way directing man. Personality, power, wisdom of God, the invisible things of him are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made. The heathen are without excuse because of this natural objective revelation. There is also a law in their conscience so that they in conduct and motive accuse or excuse one another. This is natural revelation objective. But there is supernatural revelation objective in the person of Jesus Christ, subjective in the possession of his Spirit. Natural revelation is without self-explanation. The leaf does not have its genesis or apocalypse written on its back. Supernatural revelation brings with it the history of its genesis and explains divine mysteries. Man discovers science. But God has revealed what man could never discover. What man can do for himself God lets him do, but what is beyond the power of human discovery God must tell, if it is to be known by man. The revelation of what is not of man's innate power to discover is superhuman, is supernatural. How shall that which is above man, yet not above reason, come to him? What is the relation of the divine action to human spontaneity? God must condescend, and man must be lifted up. Man becomes God-breathed and then thinks God's thoughts after him. Does inspiration involve illumination of all truth? Only of that which is of divine revelation. Does inspiration cover all contents of the record? All that is produced by inspiration.

The historical inaccuracy of Stephen was not inspired. Is inspiration necessary to receive a revelation? Are we inspired to receive the revelation of Scripture? The patriarchs received revelations without being inspired to apprehend them. Supernatural revelations came through Jesus to common men without any unusual divine action to make the recipients susceptible. Is there inspiration without revelation? Luke was inspired, but we have no reason to think that in writing his gospel or the Acts he received revelations. He was inspired to record. He had by his own statement the materials from which to secure

the facts of his record. Did he need inspiration simply to record what he was in circumstances able to record with accuracy? Granted the adequacy of natural opportunity to know, and ability accurately to record, yet which of you will write the history of him whom you have learned supremely to love, who has suffered indignities and contumelies, endured from enemies, his and yours, agonies unspeakable, brutal spite, spittings, calumnies, and death detestable, and not inveigh one sentence against the shame, the injustice and violent cruelty? It is not human, it is not natural for man so to repress himself. It is superhuman, supernatural. If there were no need of inspiration to exclude inerrancy of statement, there was, to prevent redundancy of emotion. Luke must write not only accurately from collected briefs, but dispassionately, repressing the human. But this does not cover all the need of spiritual superintendence. If of suggestion there were no need, yet of direction there was. How can one keep his recollection of events occurring amid strange mysteries separate from what his mind sees in them by the explanation which comes with time? The interpretation will unconsciously enter into the record and color the primary the significance, the primary feeling and impression. The philosophy of the event will be woven into the web of the history. The eye or ear witness may not diverge from the truth in his philosophy of the event, but the recorder of another's briefs not participant in the circumstances, mental states or emotions of the historical occasions, will read his own mind into them. That which was but history to Luke is to us both history and revelation, and the divine factor of inspiration was needful to repress the unconsciously falsifying human element and make the revelation authoritative for us. The natural powers of man are not suspended, but the rational and spiritual consciousness is illuminated by a divine factor. The guidance of man into truth by the Spirit implies a human element to be guided. The human reason is also a factor in the guidance. It is the writer that is inspired and not the writing. God inbreathes the man. Mechanical theories, the verbal, or mystical, an exaggerated form of the verbal, leave no room for the real

man as a factor receiving divine communications or recording them. The Holy Spirit is thus the real writer, and man is but the tool or instrument, the pen in the hand of the Spirit. It is not necessary to quote the acceptance and expressions of this theory from our early Lutheran theologians. To their mind man was a flute for God to play upon. Their theory sprang urgently forward to defend the Scriptures against the claim of the Roman Church that it was the Church which gave the Scriptures authority. Since the Reformation rejected the absolute authority of the Church, in order to keep the Scriptures authoritative as an unfallible rule, they were declared to be solely and wholly divine by means of a mechanical conveyance. The theory was the child of the age, the creature of necessitous circumstances, but it has lived its life, and outlived its necessity.

Nor, on the other hand, can the consciousness of the vital Christian abide the rationalistic theories of humanism. Mere genius, or poetic enlightenment as a guidance into religious conceptions cannot bring man into the comprehension or possession of the supernatural. And a supernatural there is, however we may struggle to express or explain the reality. The consciousness of it will not die. The so-called dynamical theory, the combination of human elements with the divine in the communication ond transmission of supernatual truth can alone satisfactorily explain to us in partial measure the realities of our faith. Though conceptions of the content of this theory may considerably vary and undergo developing modifications, yet somewhere in its folds must the abiding truth be found. The door is open for attack by reason of admissions which must be mane to honest research and reverent historical study of the Scriptures. But reverent search for truth, and truth that abides, are not conflicting principles. Some may fear for the foundations of faith if the admission be made that the Bible is not absolutely infallible in the entirety of its content. What guarantee against error have we if inspiration secures infallibility of revelation, but not absolutely of its record? That which is of historical error can be corrected with no detriment to the faith. It is not the supernatural that is errant, not the vital content of

revelation that can be corrected. Man may err in the history of his own world, for it is his to know, to discover, and to amend in statement. But in what is of the world above him he could not discover error, if such there were; for all he knows of the supernatural world is God-given, and while in this world of criticism he cannot enter there to verify. But is there, and can there be, any real inspiration which is not verbal? Not by audible divine voice, but by language is revelation given us. Can there be divine ideas floating in the air like songs without words? This is a confusion in thought. Songs without words floating in air are not songs till they leave the air and thrill the auditory nerves. A distinction is to be made between a symbol and its content. The word is not the idea, but contains, or suggests it. The word is only sound, or character. The mind transposes it into idea. A word is but symbol; mind makes it thought. More correctly, the sound, or written character, is the occasion of that which is impalpable and potentially spiritual. The word is earthy, human; the thought it calls into existence is spiritual, revelatory. The Bible is the word of God respecting revelation. The Bible contains the word of God respecting verbal character. The letter killeth; the Spirit giveth life That which is subtle and mysterious in its action, is elusive to the mental grasp. Its nature cannot be analyzed, and its explanation escapes formula. It is of no use to cast anchor and wait for the day of comprehensive grasp of inspiration. That day will only dawn in the land where God and the Lamb are the light thereof. Though the night be troublous and misty, yet we see enough firm ground on which to base our faith in the word of God.

ARTICLE III.

DE USU SACRAMENTORUM.*

By Rev. W. E. Parson, D. D.

De usu Sacramentorum docent, quod Sacramenta instituta sint, non modo ut sint notae professionis inter homines, sed magis ut sint signa et testimonia voluntatis Dei erga nos, ad excitandam et confirmandam fidem in his, qui utuntur, proposita.

Itaque utendum est sacramentis ita ut fides accedat, quae credat promissionibus, quae per Sacramenta exhibentur et ostenduntur. Damnant igitur illos, qui docent, quod Sacramenta ex opere operato justificent, nec docent fidem requiri in usu Sacramentorum, quae credat remitti peccata.

The phrase "the churches with common consent among us," found in the first article of the Confession, belongs to all the articles that follow. With this slight modification the Thirteenth Article will read:

OF THE USE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

Concerning the use of the Sacraments [the churches with common consent among us] teach that they were ordained, not only to be marks of profession amongst men, but rather that they should be signs and testimonies of the will of God toward us, set forth unto us, to stir up and confirm faith in such as use them. Therefore men must use the Sacraments so as to join faith with them, which believes the promises that are offered and declared unto us by the Sacraments. Wherefore they condemn those that teach that the Sacraments do justify by the work done, and do not teach that faith which believes the remission of sins is requisite in the use of the Sacraments."†

*Holman Lecture on Article XIII., of the Augsburg Confession, delivered May 29th, 1900.

†Dr. Krauth's translation as given in Dr. Jacobs's Book of Concord.

The main points in this article, when drawn out in detail, are found to be as follows:

1. What is set forth is the doctrine of our churches.

2. This doctrine is held, at least theoretically, with unanimity.

3. The Sacraments are of divine appointment.

4. They are marks of the Christian profession, but

5. This external use of them is of subordinate value.

6. There is a much higher use which perfects the Sacraments.

7. The higher use makes them signs and testimonies of the will of God.

8. The Sacraments were ordained especially for this end.

9. The right use of the Sacraments will result in exciting faith, and in confirming faith, in them that use them.

10. The true use of the Sacraments is not reached until faith is joined with them.

11. This faith believes the promises which always accompany the Sacraments.

12. The Sacraments offer and declare the promises.

13. Any doctrine conflicting with this statement is condemned.

14. Especially is the teaching that the Sacraments justify, in and of themselves, condemned.

15. Also they are condemned who say that faith is not necessary.

16. Or teach that it is not required in the use of the Sacra ments to believe in the forgiveness of sins.

Each one of the forgoing points is clearly contained in this article of the Confession. As the General Synod has twice declared (at York in 1864, and at Hagerstown in 1895), that the Augsburg Confession, properly interpreted, is throughout in perfect consistence with the Holy Scriptures, we assume that every statement of this article is at the same time a doctrine of our Church, and one of the "fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word," on which our Confession is declared to be founded.

The title of this thirteenth article was evidently determined by the first three words of the article, De Usu Sacramentorum.

It is not a speculative but a practical study, on which we enter. The dogmatic teachings in connection with the sacraments fall under the respective articles treating of the Sacraments in detail. Here, there is gathered up in one brief statement and presented to us the chief use or place of the Sacraments in our Protestant system.

There is first an announcement of the function which the Sacrament is to perform when properly used. *Negatively*, it is not, as the Sacramentarians of the Reformation times declared, a mark of our Christian profession. This, indeed, it is, but as this is not its chief function, it is so declared in the words "*not only marks, but rather*;" which words point to a much higher use of the Sacrament. *Positively*, this use is indicated when it is said that the Sacrament is a sign and testimony of the will of God. It always carries with it a promise of God. It excites and confirms faith, which is led to lay hold on the promises. Therefore the Sacrament is not to be thought of as a thing alone, and apart from faith. There is no benefit from the Sacrament when faith does not attend it; for it has no magical power; it does not work independently of the presence or absence of faith. It is not an *opus operatum.*

Thus the foundation of the Protestant system is here in this brief article, and the issue is joined with Rome, whose doctrines respecting Christ, sin, the Sacraments, faith, works, and other related subjects, are at every point at right angles to our Evangelical teachings.

I.

The Augsburg Confession, like the Scriptures from which it was drawn, with which it claims to be in perfect consistence throughout, is a mine of truth that cannot be exhausted.

The history of this marvelous document is as fascinating as the story of a life.

Indeed, the student soon discovers that many lives went to the making of it, with all the cross-purposes that enter into the

romance and tragedy of life. The man who was the true author of the document was many miles away, under the ban; while those who were on the ground, at Augsburg awaiting imperial audience, had reason to believe they were likely to write their signatures to it in blood.

There are other epoch-making documents which have been less closely related to the welfare of men. The first Magna Charta, marking a stage in the progress of liberty; the Legacy of Iyeyas the greatest of the Emperors of Japan; the Will of Peter the Great, the first of the Czars; our own Declaration of Independence, with Washington's Farewell Address, despite the cloud that has fallen over them in these last days, have, in turn, had great influence on the people for whom they were intended. These were political treatises, while the Magna Charta of Augsburg was a declaration of spiritual independence, whose effect was religious—save only as an incidental result of its deliverance has been to foster the spirit of freedom, giving men the courage to stand for political and religious liberty.

Dr. Holman has put the Church in his debt for all time by the founding of this course of lectures. Our own men can be the better acquainted with their Church's history and doctrine. They can also rebuke the errors of others. A conspicuous living teacher has recently declared that the Christians of the sixteenth century presented "certain theories of the universe as constituting the essence of Christianity. You would find them to-day embodied in the Creed of Pius IV, in the Westminster Confession of Faith, or in the Thirty-nine Articles."*

How could one who was looking for the essence of Christianity cite the Westminster Confession, which belongs to a later century, in proof of a statement respecting the sixteenth century; and how could he commit the more glaring error of not citing the Augsburg Confession, when searching for the essence of Christianity in the sixteenth century—the document of that century which made Protestantism, and determined by reaction the Creed of Pius IV, as well?

*Lyman Abbott, in the *Outlook*, Jan. 13, 1900, p. 109.

The manner of this article is Melanchthon's, the matter is Luther's. For, while the Preceptor formed the whole document, we know how completely the master-mind of the Reformation informs it all.

The Marburg Articles, prepared chiefly by Luther, in the early part of October preceding the Augsburg Diet, became the basis of the Schwabach Articles, prepared later in the same month. These seventeen Schwabach Articles, revised and changed in some respects, became the first part of the Augsburg Confession. Thus Luther is the author of the Confession, as to its matter and substance, by every law of literary fairness and just principle of determining authorship. As Dr. Krauth puts it in his Conservative Reformation.

"Every sentence, every word of the Augsburg Confession as it stands, embodies the faith of Luther, and received his unqualified, repeated, and enthusiastic assent." *

If we turn back to the Schwabach and Marburg Articles and compare the phraseology there found with the language of this thirteenth article we discover an identity of thought and phrase, the characteristic marks peculiar to Luther appearing in each of the three documents.

"The seventeen articles forming the first part of the Confession clearly appear as the reconstruction of the seventeen Schwabach Articles. In this the fundamental main part, the Augsburg Confession is essentially the spiritual product of Luther." †

Dr. Richard, in his life of Melanchthon, says that the Schwabach "Articles bear throughout the imprint of Luther's peculiar spirit, and contain a more positive and distinct statement of the Lutheran doctrines than is found in the Marburg Articles." ‡

Dr. Zoeckler rightly credits Melanchthon with editorship, such as combining the parts, adding the preface to the Emperor; and in general whatever pertained to the editorial completion of the document. "Melanchthon carried on this editorial work

*Conservative Reformation, p. 241.

†Prof. Dr. O. Zoeckler, in Lutheran Cyclopedia, Art. Augs. Confession.

‡Philip Melanchthon, J. W. Richard, D. D., p. 189.

with greatest carefulness during the first two months of his stay at Augsburg before Emperor Charles appeared and the activity of the diet began."

The numbers of the Schwabach Articles correspond in part to the articles of the Augsburg Confession. They coincide not only in phraseology but in doctrine also. "So thoroughly do the Schwabach Articles condition and shape every part of it, as to give it even the peculiarity of phraseology characteristic of Luther. To a large extent, therefore, Melanchthon's work is but an elaboration of Luther's, and to a large extent it is not an elaboration, but a reproduction. To Luther belong the doctrinal power of the Confession, its inmost life and spirit, and to Melanchthon its matchless form. Both are in some sense its authors, but the most essential elements of it are due to Luther, who is by pre-eminence its author, as Melanchthon is its composer * * * and the Augsburg Confession is in its inmost texture the theology of the New Testament as Luther believed it."*

To show the close connection between the Augustana and the two statements of October, 1529, we need only cite the articles treating of one of the Sacraments.

The ninth Marburg Article declared that because God's Word is in baptism, "it is not a mere empty sign or symbol among Christians, but a sign and work of God, wherein our faith is required through which we are regenerated."

The ninth Schwabach Article says that baptism, the first sign or Sacrament, consists of two parts, namely, Water and the Word of God, or that men should be baptized with water, and God's Word be spoken.

The ninth Augsburg Article simply restates the doctrine.

II.

The question might arise why this declaration as to the true use of the Sacraments did not follow Articles IX. and X. on Baptism and the Lord's Supper. That would seem to have been

*Krauth's Conservative Reformation, p. 219, *et seq.*

the natural and logical order, whereas Articles XI. and XII. intervene on Confession and Repentance.

The explanation of the order of the articles must be found in the fact that the Protestant conception and definition of a Sacrament, as later reached, had not yet been fully crystalized. The true Scriptural idea of a Sacrament, which would limit the number to two, was to be unfolded by the contest with Rome. She erroneously multiplied the Sacraments, failing to distinguish, as the Reformers did, between the things of human appointment and the things having the unfailing marks of the divine enactment. These two marks were afterwards set forth as the Word of God and the external act, in accordance with the maxim of Augustine—*Accedit Verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum.* Luther acknowledges the validity of three Sacraments, Baptism, the Lord's Supper and Repentance; though he adds that, in strict speech, there is but one Sacrament, the "mystery," (musterion) of salvation, and three signs of this mystery. A little later he explains that Repentance, the subject of Articles XI. and XII. in the Confession, is not a Sacrament because it lacks a visible sign appointed by God. The Lutheran doctrine of two Sacraments was a development. The distinction between a Sacrament and a ceremony, was clearly set forth later in the Apology. We may cite here, as well as anywhere, the exposition of this thirteenth article as given in Article VII. of the Apology.

"In the thirteenth article the adversaries approve our statement that the Sacraments are not only marks of profession among men, as some imagine, but that they are rather signs and testimonies of God's will toward us, through which God moves hearts to believe.

But here they bid us also count seven Sacraments. We hold that it should be maintained that the matters and ceremonies instituted in the Scriptures, whatever the number, be not neglected. Neither do we think that it makes much difference, even though, for the purpose of teaching, others reckon otherwise, provided they still preserve aright the matters handed down in

Scripture. Neither have the ancients reckoned in the same manner.

If we call the Sacraments, 'rites which have the command of God and to which the promise of grace has been added,' it is easy to decide what are properly Sacraments. For rites instituted by men will not in this way be Sacraments properly so-called.

For it does not belong to human authority to promise grace. Wherefore signs instituted without God's command, are not sure signs of grace, even though they perhaps instruct the rude, or admonish as to something.

Therefore Baptism, the Lord's Supper and Absolution, which is the Sacrament of repentance, are truly Sacraments. For these rites have God's command and the promise of grace which is peculiar to the New Testament * * * Confirmation and Extreme Unction are rites received from the Fathers, which not even the Church requires as necessary to salvation, because they do not have God's command. * * *

It is still more needful to understand *how the Sacraments are to be used.*

Here we condemn the whole crowd of Scholastic doctors, who teach that the Sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato* without a good disposition on the part of the one using them, provided he do not place a hindrance in the way. * * * Thus we teach that in the use of the Sacraments *faith* ought to be added, which should believe these promises, and receive the promised things which are there offered in the Sacraments. And the reason is plain and thoroughly grounded. The promise is useless unless it be received by faith.

But the Sacraments are the signs of the promises.

Therefore in the use of the Sacraments faith ought to be added, so that if any one use the Lord's Supper, he use it thus." (Apology Art. VII).

The Sacrament is instituted of God, therefore divine.

The ceremony is instituted of man, therefore human.

The Sacrament is unchangeable. The ceremony is variable. The Sacrament communicates the grace of God. The ceremony

may hinder grace, especially if it be exalted to the place of a Sacrament.

It was in this understanding of the difference between a Sacrament and a ceremony that Luther communes without Confession, "to show his contempt of the devil;" careless of the ceremony but careful as to the Sacrament.

When the Apology makes absolution a Sacrament it is only in the sense declared in Article V., that absolution is nothing else but the gospel. The same idea is expressed by Luther in the Large Catechism—"When we admonish to Confession, therefore, we do nothing else but admonish everyone to become a Christian."

The fifth and sixth articles in the Apology are among the noblest presentations of the gospel truths known to theological literature. They treat of Repentance and Confession, as Sacraments, in the sense already explained. The whole scheme of salvation is involved in a right understanding of this matter, for as the Apology says: "No one can embrace the announcement of the remission of sins, except through faith alone."

Luther in the Larger Catechism says of Repentance, which he calls the third Sacrament, "baptism both in its virtue and in its signification, comprehends the third Sacrament also, which it was customary to call repentance, which is properly nothing else but baptism, or its use."

In the Babylonish Captivity already he sums up the matter thus:

"It has seemed best, however, to consider as Sacraments, properly so called, those promises which have signs annexed to them. The rest, as they are not attached to signs, are simple promises. It follows that, if we speak with perfect accuracy, there are only two Sacraments in the Church of God, Baptism and the Bread; since it is in these alone that we see both a sign divinely instituted and a promise of remission of sins. The Sacrament of penance, which I have reckoned along with these two, is without any visible and divinely appointed sign; and is nothing else, as I have said, than a way and means of return to baptism."

From all of which it is clear that in the early period of the Reformation the question of the number of the Sacraments was still in doubt. Chemnitz, (Ex. Conc. Trid., II., 14) declares that absolution may be a Sacrament, with the qualification which he makes, as follows: "Absolution is not properly and truly a Sacrament in the way or sense in which Baptism and the Lord's Supper are Sacraments; but if any one, with this explanation and difference added, would wish to call it a Sacrament on account of the peculiar application of the promise, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession declares that it would not oppose the idea."

III.

The common distinction between Sacrament and sacrifice is to be borne in mind. In the Sacrifice man brings something to God. In the Sacrament God brings something to man.

This distinction marks the wide difference that is found between Christianity and the non-Christian religions. In these latter there are rites, cruel, meaningless often, and without avail for taking away sins. There are ceremonies, and sacrifices, but no Sacraments. We understand this when we remember that the religion is in each case a human growth, having the signs of man's need; the hunger, the prayer, the sacrificial side of religion in crude form.

The God-ward side, that would reveal the Divine purpose, the Sacramental side, is a blank. We cannot study the history of the struggles of the soul in other races, the vast outlying religions, with any kind of sympathy or sense of fairness, until the principle is grasped that in all races of men there has been this same reaching out after God. Brahmin and Buddhist, Parsee and Shinto, were all impelled to bring something to God, which is the essence of a sacrifice. They never advanced to the point of getting some direct gift or communication from God, which is the essence of a Sacrament.

Wherever any heathen soul, or any pagan religion, has had a good intention in it, any nobility, any desire for a better state, any longing for light amid the universal darkness, there has been the obverse of the Sacrament.

These papan longings have been called unconscious prophecies of Christ. We might designate them as anticipations of the Sacrament just as all hunger is suggestive of food, though the needed bread be never supplied.

Dr. Jacobs has given a sentiment, in the recent General Conference, that might seem to conflict with this position. He says:

"Before the sacrificial element can be found in worship, the Sacramental must be there."*

That is true in the fuller sense in our Christian theme of thought.

But we may find the shadow of the truth in the ideas of the heathen.

Their sacrifices are expressive of their need of the Sacrament which comes from God. Their need of the Saviour is none the less urgent that they have never heard of him.

In the best of the ethnic religions we see the most that the soul can do towards its own salvation, which is nothing.

The religions we call false have at least this much truth in them, that they emphasize our Christian doctrine that all the sacrifices man can make do not bring peace to the soul. In the Son of Man only is both sacrifice and Sacrament.

IV.

THIS IS A FUNDAMENTAL ARTICLE.

"The churches with common consent among us teach" is the announcement that there is agreement as to the doctrine herein taught, and by inference it is a necessary doctrine. It is one of the *fundamental* doctrines of the divine word which are declared to be correctly exhibited in the Augsburg Confession. This particular statement, therefore, becomes a fundamental doctrine of the Church. Otherwise it would not be included in the list of things taught, and especially not in the list of things taught "with common consent among us."

If it should be suggested that this one article, or any other in the Confession, is not fundamental, in the sense that it is necessary to salvation, the reply must be made that it is at least fun-

*Proceedings of General Conference, p. 162.

damental to the scheme of doctrine held by our Church, since it finds a place in the original statement, reaffirmed by every church entitled to the name Lutheran from that day to this.

Our General Synod so declares in her doctrinal basis, receiving and holding the Word of God as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word.

The word fundamental is descriptive of the doctrines contained in the Confession. True, it stands before the phrase "doctrines of the Divine Word"; but it follows the phrase "correct exhibition."

Unless, therefore, we make the doctrines exhibited in the Augsburg Confession the equivalent of "the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word" and co-extensive therewith we are simply playing with words "that palter with us in a double sense."

The General Synod so intends to declare by its recent action expressing "its entire satisfaction with the present form of doctrinal basis and confessional subscription, which is the Word of God the infallible rule of faith and practice, and the unaltered Augsburg Confession as throughout in perfect consistence with it," which is substantially the language used in the York repudiation resolutions by the General Synod in 1864.

We are reduced to this dilemma respecting this article, or any article of the Confession—if the teaching in it is not the true doctrine derived from the Word of God, in perfect consistence with it throughout, then it is not a fundamental doctrine and ought to be eliminated from the list of fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word. The true teaching must be inserted in its place. There is no escaping this conclusion. That is what our Presbyterian friends are consistently doing when they demand a revision of the Westminster Confession.

The revisers among us, of a former day, have at least this to be said in their favor, that they set down in *definite* terms what they proposed to expurgate from the Creed.

Our whole doctrinal system is built upon the idea that the Word of God is the sole arbiter in doctrine. The Form of Concord, the most elaborate of the Symbolical Books, emphasizes in its opening sentences the prophetic and apostolic scriptures as the only standard by which all doctrines and teachers and to be tried and judged.

Beside such a statement that the difference between the Holy Scripture and all other writings will be preserved, how exceedingly grotesque appear the vaporings of some of our modern recensionists, who declare "We accept the Augsburg Confession only as to fundamental doctrines."

Like a prophetic voice from the olden time to fit our day do we hear the preface to the Form of Concord saying: "Concerning the summary of our Christian doctrine we have only meant that we have a unanimously received, definite, common form of doctrine, which our Evangelical Churches together and in common confess."

In a recent debate, in the House of Representatives at Washington, on a constitutional question, one of the leaders of the House declared with emphasis—"the fathers of our country in building the Constitution did not build a trap," adding—"they ought to know what they meant, and it ought to mean now what it meant then."

The same principle holds in religious matters and in Creed interpretation. Until some authorized change is made in our basis, no person in the church can honestly subscribe our Confession *in part only*. He converts it into a trap with which to ensnare the unwary, when he erects a fictitious distinction between essential and non-essential doctrines calling some fundamental and others non-fundamental.

Put Confession in the place of the word *Constitution*, and hear an eloquent Senator call back from the other end of the Capitol, in words that fit both *Constitution* and *Confession*:

"I will never believe that our Constitution manacles our hands and narrows our vision and numbs our brain. I will never admit that our Constitution is such a charter of death. I will never admit that our fathers, those master minds of history's

most expanding race, so anchored us within a narrow and a stagnant harbor when the high seas call us. Ho! my faith is in a Constitution which is a chart by which we sail all seas and make all ports—a Constitution which is a free commission for the exercise of our strength as it developes." [Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, in the U. S. Senate, March 29th, 1900.]

In confirmation of which, a colleague declares: "There are in the instrument neither exceptions nor provisos—nor any place for expediency." [Senator Bate, of Tenn. in U. S. Senate, Apr. 2, 1900.]

The Confession hangs together with a consistency and completeness of evangelical statement that would almost justify a claim of inspiration on the part of its makers.

This article on the use of the Sacraments, with its denial of the opus operatum of Rome, throws its interpreting light over the four preceding articles on the Sacraments; it runs back to Article Four, on Justification; and then to the Third Article on the Saviour's nature and work; that again depends on the view we have of sin, of which the Second Article treats; and that in turn hangs on the right conception of God, of whose being the First Article declares. There is an articulated system, an interplay of truth, so that it is impossible to omit one part and not offend in all.

We need to remember that the titles of the Doctrinal Articles did not originally belong to the document, but were the work of later editors, as are the chapter and page headings of the Scriptures.

As Articles IV., V. and VI. ran together into one general subject on Justification, so Articles IX., X., XI. and XII., combined in one statement the doctrines of the Reformers respecting the Sacraments. Then follows, naturally, this article on the use of the Sacraments, containing a declaration of principles applying to all the preceding articles, at least as far as the Sacraments were concerned. Here is seen another reason, in the original construction of the Confession, why it would be most unfair to pick and choose among the articles.

It is not a patch-work. It is a unit. It was presented as a

unit. It was subscribed as a unite. It was antagonized as a unit. Even the man who, having shaped and polished at the first, presumed that he might continue to treat the document as his own, after it had passed beyond his control, never ventured to modify it by the omission of any article from the original number.

The Augsburg Confession may not be the last word of our church as to the doctrine she confesses. It is not! She has amplified the statement in the Apology; in the Larger Catechism; in the Smalcald Articles; in the Formula of Concord. In the future it may be necessary to make further declaration as to her belief. There may be more, but there will never be less than the original document.

What is once fundamental is always fundamental.

We do not say that the Creed is unchangeable because the Church is infallible.

No! But we do say that since the Creed is the statement of the Church's interpretation of the unchangeable Word, the Creed cannot change until the Church authorizes an ampler statement.

In this sense the Creed is, for the time being, as fixed as the Word of God itself. Honest dealing with the creed presupposes such a relation between the Word and the Creed.

Evidently Dr. Valentine must so understand the subscription to the A. C. as he says, concerning the General Synod's Confessionae Position. [See Article on same in Luth. Cyclo]:

"There is no need, therefore, of specifying its teaching, as the Confession itself is the sufficient statement of its doctrine"—which must mean that the entire Confession is the correct "exhibition," else there *would* be need to specify.

V.

There are three different views of the Sacraments embraced in this Article. Two of these were reckoned fundamentally erroneous, and by inference the third view is both true and fundamental. One partial view is designated in the clause, "non modo ut sint notae professionis inter homines;" and the other error is contained the damnatory clause, at the end of the

article, in which the opposite extreme is reached, now technically known as the doctrine *opus operatum.* These opposing errors are met throughout the entire range of related doctrines in these two dissimilar schools of theology. The error is as vital, far-reaching, and influential as the truth. Unless, therefore, we are prepared to say that the false doctrine has an insignificant value with respect to the whole scheme of truth, we cannot take any doubtful position as to the fundamental character of this and every other article in our Confession.

With respect to the particular subject under discussion in this article, the three views may be classified as the Rationalistic, the Romish, and the Lutheran or Biblical. The Rationalist says that the Sacrament is only a sign. Baptism is a sign of the washing away of sins, as water washes away the filth of the body. The Lord's Supper is a sign of the fact that Christ's body was broken and his blood shed for the remission of sins. The baptized, communing believer wears these two "marks of profession among men." The Rationalist makes the Sacrament spectacular only. He is in a worse case than the scholastics who transform the Sacraments into an actual vehicle for communicating grace. The Romanist says that the Sacrament is not a sign, but the wonder-working power of God. It is the washing away of sin; it is the body, blood, soul and divinity of Christ. Nothing else is received by the mouth. Faith is not an element. It is only necessary not to oppose, and the work is wrought. Here the extremes meet. The Rationalist has made the Sacraments a mere spectacle, a picture, a show, emptying it of the significance which Christ gave to it in the institution of it. For unless it is more, it is less, and drops into the inferior place, to be lightly esteemed, or displaced altogether. Ralph Waldo Emerson was the consistent rationalist. He delivered his sermon denying the validity of the Sacrament, and walked down out of the pulpit, never to enter it again.

The Romanist, at the other extreme, also presents the Sacrament as a show, making claims which are against reason and Scripture. His doctrine of grace raises up a race of skeptics who are not willing to believe that transubstantiation is the

teaching of the Saviour. As over against these two errors, our doctrine includes what was true in both, and avoids what was false in both. The Lutheran teaching is that there is no Scriptural authority for a Sacramental presence except in the Sacramental action. It is only in the eating and in the drinking that the promise of the bodily presence belongs.

The assurance of the forgiveness of sins is the chief thing. This assurance is communicated with the words of distribution —"given and shed for you"—The bodily presence does not bring forgiveness, therefore the bodily presence is a subordinate factor in the Supper, the supreme thing being the assurance of the forgiveness of sins. This assurance must be believed in order to be efficacious. The Sacrament is more, therefore, than sign. It comes to us in connection with the words—"given and shed for you" as the strongest pledge that can be given to each communicant that Christ has died for him, and that all the benefits of Christ's redeeming work are truly his. The Lutheran theory of the Sacrament is as complete doctrinally as it is perfect in its harmony with the fundamental teachings of the word of God respecting grace. We say that the Sacrament communicates the word, and the word communicates the grace. Thus we escape the vain show of the Sacramentarians, who say there is only an empty sign, which at most is not more than the shadow of the grace of God. We avoid also the opposite error of the scholastics, who say there is a perpetual miracle to be performed in the Sacraments; that there is no need of the word, since the grace is communicated immediately, *ex opere operato.*

After contemplating these irrational theories, which have a common bond in that they are not justified by any teachings of Christ, we come back to prize more highly our reasonable and eminently Scriptural doctrine. "It is the word that communicates all the grace; and it is faith in the word of promise, accompanying the outward ceremony, that alone receives the blessing."*

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." This is

*Dr. H. E. Jacobs, article on the Sacraments, in *Lutheran Cyclopedia.*

the simple declaration of the Saviour. In the face of this New Testament record the Rationalist says, in effect, that he that believeth does not need to be baptized; for he asks consistently: What is the use of a sign after the thing signified has been accomplished? While the Romanist, with like perversity, maintains that he that is baptized does not need to believe.

We pick up Luther's question and answer, and they seem like pure gold shining in a heap of rubbish.

"How can water produce such great effects? It is not the water indeed that produces these effects but the word of God which accompanies and is connected with the water, and our faith, which relies on the word of God connected with the water. For the water, without the word of God, is simply water." Here is not only the New Testament, but a deep and true philosophy. For the water without the word might still be sign, and if baptism were to have its chief interpretation in signifying something, then the water might mean enough to constitute a Sacrament, from the Rationalist point of view. No! says Luther, the water is simply water and no baptism. All the water in the ocean will not constitute a Sacrament. One handful of water, with the word of God, brings together what no man may put asunder. The word added to the element makes the Sacrament.

Luther counted the Zwinglian doctrine of the Lord's Supper and the Romish doctrine of satisfaction for sin as among the teachings that could not be tolerated.

The Smalcald Articles (Art. XIII.) identify Münzer and the Pope as of the same spirit though at the opposite poles doctrinally. Münzer at the head of the enthusiasts, or rationalists, is type of all those who "wish to be acute judges between the Spirit and the letter, and yet know not what they say or propose."

On the other hand "the Papacy is nothing but enthusiasm, by which the Pope boasts that all laws exist in the shrine of his heart, and whatever he decides and commands in his churches, is Spirit and law, even though it be above and contrary to Scripture and the spoken word."

Dr. Krauth has set forth in his Conservative Reformation, in a fascinating way the common ground on which the Rationalist and the Romanist stand. "It is worth noticing," he says, "that widely as Romanism, with its transubstantiation, and Rationalism, with its Symbol, differ in their results, they run into their error by the same fallacious principle of interpretation—each applying it with the same arbitrariness, but to different objects. The Romanist wishes to do away with the Scripture testimony in regard to the bread and wine; and, although they bear their name *before* the Lord's Supper, *during* the Lord's Supper, and *after* the Lord's Supper, he insists that there is neither bread nor wine there, but only their accidents. * * *. He deserts the letter and reaches Transubstantiation. The Rationalist wishes to retain the bread and wine, and therefore holds that what the Scripture *calls* bread and wine, *is* bread and wine; but he wishes to do away with the Scripture testimony in regard to the body and blood; and although the Scripture says, that of that which the Saviour tells them to take, eat, he declares most explicitly: This is my body; and of that which he tells them to drink, he says, this is my blood,—though it says that the bread is the communion of his body and the cup the communion of his blood—though it declares that the guilt of the heedless communicant is that he does not 'discern the Lord's body,' and that he that eateth and drinketh unworthily is guilty of the body and blood of Christ; in the face of all this he insists that there is in the Lord's Supper only the shadow, image, or sign of the body and blood of Christ, not the true body and true blood. With what face can a Rationalist meet a Romanist, or a Romanist meet a Rationalist? No wonder that the Rationalist, after all, is less violent against Romanism than against the pure doctrine of our church. There is the secret affinity of error between them; and Romanism does not so hate Rationalism, Rationalism does not so hate Romanism, as both hate unswerving fidelity to the word of God." (Krauth's Conservative Reformation, p. 626, 627).

Between these extremes all phases of Sacramental doctrine are found. Luther designates them roughly as the "sneaks"

and the "shaved fellows," meaning the mystics and the scholastics; the same two schools which to-day dispute the field, described (in the same connection from which the former quotation was taken), as "the brassy glitter of Rationalism, or the scarlet rags of Rome."

VI.

Here is one of the vicious mistakes of the Reformed or Rationalistic teaching as to the Sacraments. They declare that there is no inherent virtue in the Sacrament. What they mean to say is, that there is no inherent virtue in the element by it self. They vitiate the definition of a Sacrament. They forget that the element by itself is not a Sacrament. They would scarcely venture to say that there is no inherent virtue in the word—Yet there is no Sacrament without the word. The word is everywhere made the chief thing in our Lutheran system of doctrine. The water is only water, without the word. The bread is only bread, without the word. If they will grant, therefore, that there is inherent virtue in the word, they must grant that there is inherent virtue in the Sacrament, since there can be no Sacrament without the word.

Here is the ground for our contention that the validity of the Sacrament does not depend upon the holiness of the administrant, nor on the faith of the person receiving the Sacrament. We rest the Sacrament on the word and promise of God. When our Confession sets forth her definition of the Church as embracing all those among whom the word is received in purity and the Sacraments rightly administered, it is but saying that the word must be received in its purity. For the chief thing in the Sacraments is the word. From one point of view the word is the only means of Grace.

If our Lutheran theology seems to exalt the Sacraments unduly at times, it must be remembered that in so doing we are only exalting the word. This is our conception of the Sacrament, and its relation to the word. Here is the point of emphasis in our use of the Sacraments. Strictly speaking, there is but one means of grace—which is the word. So we mean

when we speak of the word and Sacraments as the means of grace. As there can be no Sacrament without the word, we cannot speak of the Sacraments as means of grace in a sense different from that applied to the word.

With such definitions and limitations, we can say that the Sacrament is as necessary as the word.

With such definitions and limitations, how misleading is a sentence like this from a Reformed source. "Tenfold more is said in Scripture of the necessity and efficiency of the Word in the salvation of men, than is therein said or implied of the power of the Sacraments." (Hodge's Systematic Theology, Vol. III. p. 502). This is confusing things which should not be confounded. Whatever is said of the Sacrament is said of the word, for the reason already given that there can be no Sacrament apart from the word.

As Luther says of the Lord's Supper: "If you separate the word from it, or view it apart from the words, there is nothing remaining but mere bread and wine." (Larger Catechism).

Is it still objected that we in the Lutheran Church have laid too great emphasis on the Sacraments? In reply we say that our Confession has introduced nothing which is not authorized by the word of God. It were better to err by over-emphasis of the word than to fall short by underestimating it.

The objection to transubstantiation is not that it too fully receives what the Scripture requires, but that it contradicts both the words of Christ and human reason. It is better while holding to the word of God that we should fill its language with all that the Spirit of God could by any possibility have meant us to receive, than to traverse a wilderness of rationalism through wrong critical methods, as the preacher in his opening sermon before the recent Pan-Presbyterian Alliance candidly confessed to his brethren they must do if they adopt the methods of the higher critics, and abandon a loyal adherence to the word of God. Let me quote his exact language.

"Of the necessary result of the wide acceptance of the new critical conclusion on our churches and people, it is unnecessary to speak at length. We can all see that, in the event of such

an acceptance, there will be a revolution in our ecclesiastical and religious life. It will be impossible for the Bible to continue to hold the supreme place it holds to-day; and, this ancient support of our ecclesiastical and religious life, having been withdrawn or weakened, many of us will seek some other support in its place or as its ally; like Sacramentarianism with sacerdotal directors; or aestheticism with its gratifications; or mysticism with its vague but powerful emotions. I am inclined to believe, however, that because of the intellectual habit bred in our people and our churches by the education of almost four centuries, the first halting place of the most of us will be rationalism." (The Bible and the Reformed Churches—Sermon by Prof. John DeWitt, D. D., at Seventh Council of the Reformed Churches throughout the world, p. 13).

Our Lutheran position at several points illustrates the dictum that it is better to believe too much than too little.

If it could be shown for example that in the matter of infant faith, or in the interpretation of the Sacraments, our theology had now and then gone beyond what is justified by the letter of Scripture, yet we are on safer ground than those occupy who belittle Christ and the word by an emptying process which deals stingily with what the Lord has given in large measure. To claim that the infant has faith may seem unreasonable, but the claim has some Scripture, many weighty reasons, and a long array of brilliant theologians, in its favor, with the added fact that it is dealing generously with both the divine word and the divine grace.

So of the Sacraments, as they are treated in this article of the Confession, and throughout the entire doctrinal system of our Church; their fullest use is reached not in their first and obvious interpretation as marks of a Christian profession among men; but in the deeper spiritual relation which they bear to men as vehicles of the divine promises, stirring up and confirming faith in those who so use them.

Dr. Krauth in his inimitable way has drawn attention to the difference between believing too little and believing too much with respect to a doctrine. "To claim that what is but bread

and wine really, is Christ's body and blood, may be a great absurdity—but it is the result of too absolute a trust in his word, it is the superstition of faith; but to say that what he really tells us is his body and blood, is but bread and wine, implies lack of trust in his word—it is the superstition of unbelief." (Dr. C. P. Krauth in Free Luth. Diet, p. 54).

Thus guarded, the Lutheran theology can never degenerate into a weak scheme of Sacramentarianism, its exponents remaining true to the foundation principles of our Confession which always must rest on the word of God itself as the supreme thing in the Sacraments.

As Luther declares: "Without the promise, the Sacrament is like a body without a soul, a purse without money, a figure without fulfilment, a letter without spirit." (Erl. Ed. XXVII. 153).

This is the Scriptural statement, which we are proud also to call the Lutheran doctrine. This article on the use of the Sacraments insists on the faith which believes the promises. This is more than the bodily presence.

VII.

The Zwinglian doctrine, which in the last analysis is the Rationalistic doctrine, has shown its inadequacy in the fact that the development of the doctrine among the Reformed has gone far beyond the first barren statement. In their use of the Sacraments they have made them more than marks of profession. Zwingli held the lowest doctrine as to the use of the Sacraments of any of the Reformers. As Dr. Hodge has said, not agreeing with the idea, though of the same general school theologically:

"They were to him no more means of grace than the rainbow or the heaps of stone on the banks of the Jordan. By their significancy and by association they might suggest truth and awaken feeling, but they were not channels of divine communication." (Hodge's Systematic Thology, Vol. III. p. 499).

In proof that the balder Reformed view of the Sacraments is not satisfactory to themselves, we find a very recent statement in a leading church journal to this effect: "The Sacrament is

something more than a scenic display. Its purpose is deeper than that of a mere memorial. Paul speaks of its observance, wherein there is no discernment of the Lord's Body, as a profanation." (*N. Y. Independent*, 1900, p. 622. Article on the Lord's Supper by Rev. Chas. A. Savage).

This article just quoted repeats the old mistake of charging Lutherans with teaching a doctrine of Consubstantiation. It seems an almost hopeless task to get this theological ghost laid. Yet Consubstantiation is not only denied in express terms by those who are entitled to speak for the Church, but the official documents are susceptible of no other construction. The Wittenberg Concord had declared that the body and blood are not included *locally* (localiter), *i. e.*, with respect to space in the bread, and had denied that they were in any other manner united therewith permanently, apart from the use of the Sacrament.

In conceding that the bread is the body of Christ through the Sacramental union, there was an affirmation of a truth directly opposed to what is involved in Consubstantiation. The Form of Concord lays down the well-known rule that there is no Sacrament apart from the use or action ordained by Christ. "And the use or action here is not chiefly the faith, also not only the oral participation, but the entire external, visible action of the Lord's Supper instituted by Christ. To this indeed is required, the *consecration*, or words of institution, and the *distribution* and *reception*, or oral partaking of the consecrated bread and wine, likewise the partaking of the body and blood of Christ; and apart from this use * * * it is to be regarded as no Sacrament." (Form of Concord Art. VII).

It is barely possible that these learned writers who say that Consubstantiation is the Lutheran doctrine have never looked into the matter, and are not acquainted with the confessional books which say authoritatively what our doctrine is.

Let one answer for all, as follows: "Hence is clear the odious falsity of those who charge our churches with teaching that 'the bread of the Eucharist is literally and substantially the body of Christ;' that 'the bread and body constitute one sub-

stance;' that 'the body of Christ in itself, and literally, is bruised by the teeth,' and all other monstrous absurdities of a similar nature. For we fearlessly appear to God, the searcher of hearts and the judge of consciences, as an infallible witness, that neither by Luther nor any of ours was such a thing ever said, written, or thought of." (Hutter, as quoted in Conservative Reformation, p. 766).

Have these scribblers and paragraphists ever read in our symbolical books that the chief reason why the presence of Christ in the bread is declared is, "to reject the Pope's transubstantiation, and to set forth that the substance of the bread is unchanged?"* In this connection, to show the wide-spread influence of Luther's thought, we might cite the testimony of the most illustrious Rationalist of the passing century, the English Unitarian, Dr. Martineau.

In setting forth the shortcomings of his own school of faith he has given a striking contribution in testimony to the value of the Evangelical doctrine. He declares: "I am constrained to say that neither my intellectual preference nor my moral admiration goes heartily with the Unitarian heroes, sects, or productions of any age.

"Ebionites, Arians, and Socinians, all seem to me to contrast unfavorably with their opponents, and to exhibit a type of thought and character far less worthy, on the whole, of the true genius of Christianity. I am conscious that my deepest obligations, as a learner from others, are in almost every department to writers not of my own creed. * * * That I find myself in intellectual accordance with the Socini or Biandrata or Servetus in one cardinal doctrine is as nothing compared with the intense response wrung from me by some of Luther's readings of St. Paul and by his favorite book, the 'Theologia Germanica'."

In the realm of intellect all great souls are peers. James Martineau acknowledges his debt to Luther, but until the men of his school of religious thought will drink at the deeper well of truth out of which Luther drank, they must be content to see themselves in the picture which the master spirit of Protest-

*Form of Concord, Article VII.

antism drew just four weeks before his death, emaciated in body but still strong in soul, saying: "Blessed is the man who walketh not in the counsel of the Sacramentarians; nor standeth in the way of the Zwinglians, nor sitteth in the seat of the Zurichers."

Luther was always lacking in courtesy to the person whom he denominated, "that old sorceress, Madam Reason."

The whole scheme of Lutheran theology is a prolonged arraignment of Rationalism.

One sentence from the Form of Concord may be taken as the summing up of our estimate of the value of reason in relation to supernatural things: "We are in duty bound not to interpret and explain these words of the Eternal, true, and almighty Son of God, our Lord, Creator and Redeemer, Jesus Christ, as allegorical, metaphorical, tropical expressions, as may appear to be in conformity with our reason; but with simple faith and due obedience to receive the words as they sound, in their proper and plain sense, and allow ourselves to be diverted therefrom by no objections or human contradictions, spun from human reason, however charming they may appear to the reason." (Form of Concord, Article VIII).

From all the foregoing facts and citations we may quote a sentence approvingly from Dr. Krauth, in which he reduces all schools of doctrine respecting the Secraments to two: "But two views," he says, "will remain in the ultimate struggle, the Rationalistic, Zwinglian, Arminian, Socinian, view which fully and consistently denies the whole mystery, on the one side, and the Scriptural, Catholic view, which fully and consistently recognized it on the other." (Conservative Reformation, p. 500).

This is a fair though broad division of the schools into two classes, concerning which it is added: "In some parts of the Reformed Church, as in the Church of England * * * the Catholic view is more and more in the ascendant." By the Catholic view he means the Lutheran view.

VIII.

The most interesting contribution to the Proceedings of the General Conference of Lutherans (Phila. 1898), was the testi-

mony of Rev. Dr. H. E. Jacobs on the true meaning of the bodily eating as related to the word. His words bear so directly on the subject before us in this thirteenth article that they ought to be quoted in full. He says: "For years I had been trying to teach theology before I learned to know the meaning of a well-known passage in Luther's Catechism. It is where the Catechism teaches that the chief thing in the Holy Supper is not the bodily eating and drinking, but the words: 'For you.' This I once thought referred to the bodily eating of the bread and wine, but learned that it was the Body and Blood of Christ that are here meant. Precious as is the assurance of the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ and their reception by the communicant, all this is subordinate to the Word of grace which accompanies this eating. The chief thing in the Sacrament is not the Body and Blood of Christ, but what is still greater, the promise. It is as though, for a moment, all others were excluded from Christ's thought, and he said: 'Thou art a redeemed and forgiven one. That, in thy weakness, thou mayest be sure of this, I give thee the very Body and Blood that have purchased thy salvation.' Without the word the presence even of the Body and Blood of Christ do not profit.

"Just as important as the definition of the Article of Faith itself, is the place which is given it in the system of doctrine. It is possible to hold correctly concerning the nature of the real presence; to avoid the extremes of transubstantiation on the one hand, and a mere commemorative ordinance, or a presence only to faith on the other; and, nevertheless, entirely misapply the doctrine. This we believe to have been done in many cases by the ritualists in the Church of England and elsewhere." (Proceedings of the General Conference in Phila. 1898, p. 162).

Here results a strange contradiction, seemingly. The stronger the emphasis laid on the real presence, the greater is the significance of the fact that the real presence is relatively subordinate. The real presence is not the chief thing in the Sacrament. There is something still greater, the promise.

It follows, therefore, that the more we exalt the subordinate thing the more we are at the same time exalting, what is the

chief thing in the Sacrament, the word of promise it contains.

The dangerous tendency in ritualism shows itself when the Sacramentalists shift the point of emphasis, making the subordinate thing the chief thing in the Sacrament, whether it be in Baptism, or in the Lord's Supper.

IX.

It is interesting to note the close parallel between the statement in this Thirteenth Article and the English Articles of Religion. It is a matter of which no well-informed person is in ignorance that the Thirty-nine Articles are of Lutheran origin.

The Lutheran movement in England in the sixteenth century progressed so far that only the political interference of Henry VIII., in a realm not belonging to the King, prevented an open and general acceptance of the Confessions brought from Germany. The arrangement of the Thirty-nine Articles, so far as Sacraments are concerned, is somewhat more orderly than in the Augsburg Confession, the general statement on the number and use of the Sacraments coming first, and the particular statement as to the doctrine of baptism, the Lord's Supper, the relation of the Sacrament to an unworthy administrant, following in subsequent Articles. The substance of the doctrine as to the use of the Sacraments is almost identical with our article thirteen, from which it was unquestionably taken.

In proof of which statement it may be interesting to set down here Article XXV. of the English Articles of Religion.

"Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.

"There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

"Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction,

are not to be counted for Sacraments of the gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

"The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith."

The vital part of this Article coincides, almost word for word and phrase for phrase, with our earlier article from which it was derived. The American Protestant Episcopal Church having identically the same language in her Articles, is one remove farther from the original source, and the Methodist Episcopal, with practically the same declaration, is three removes from the genuine, earliest Protestant doctrine on the use of the Sacraments. The Reformed Episcopal is substantially the same.

Dr. Jacobs in his Lutheran Movement in England has brought together an interesting body of material to show the close relationship in Reformation times between the English and Continental reformers. There is reason to believe that but for political difficulties that were hindering, the English Church was at one time ready to pledge itself to the Augsburg Confession and the Apology. With this common bond of doctrine and early history, it is not strange that now after more than three hundred years we should find the tendency in the English Church to be toward a more decidedly Lutheran interpretation of the Sacraments. That this is a fact the leaders in the Church of England openly declare to their Churches and clergy. The Primate of England, the Archbishop of Canterbury, in Canterbury Cathedral, in a recent visitation sermon to his bishops and clergy, reported in full in the London *Times* of October 11th, 1898, used the following very significant language—significant when we consider the speaker and the occasion:

"The Church of England * * * permits the teaching of

what we cannot distinguish from the Lutheran doctrine, but there it stops, and no man is allowed to teach anything that goes beyond that. Fifty years ago a great body of the clergy of this country certainly held, as far as they ever defined the matter to themselves, the doctrine of Hooker. But I do not think we can quite say the same, now that there are a good many who have since adopted the doctrine of Luther instead, although I do not think they often speak of it. I do not know that I have ever heard them speak of it as Lutheran. But it is important in times of dispute that we should clearly understand that the church has not forbidden that doctrine, and that the Supreme Court of appeal in matters ecclesiastical has so declared that this is open to all to believe if they think fit." (The Primate of England—the Archbishop of Canterbury in Canterbury Cathedral on Monday, Oct. 10, 1898, visitation sermon reported in the London *Times*, Oct. 11, 1898, p. 8).

This language is of interest in connection with a decision of the Archbishop of Canterbury, rendered during this present month, against the reservation of the Sacrament. The ritualistic, or Romanizing, party in the Church of England have been contending for the reservation of the Sacrament for the purposes of adoration, notwithstanding the Thirty-nine Articles say: "The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about." The Church of England in combatting the Romish tendencies of many of her priests and people at the present time, has no more effective weapon than the Lutheran doctrine which yet remains a part of her creed. Against this unscriptural transubstantiation heresy, which seeks to reserve and adore the Sacrament, let her hold to the true use of the Sacrament as Article Thirteen of the Augsburg Confession or Article Twenty-five of her own Creed, sets forth the doctrine.

Here is the saving influence in the present contention in the Church of England, as the Archbishop of Canterbury shows. He will allow the Lutheran teaching, but nothing more, or beyond that. The Lutheran doctrine will uproot the ritualists, and their reservation of the Sacrament; since our teaching is

that the bread, when not used as appointed by Christ, is not the body of Christ. When carried in a procession, or reserved to be gazed upon or adored, it is only bread; and they who thus reserve the Sacraments for purposes of adoration are guilty of a species of idolatry, or artolatry. The presence of Christ in the Eucharist is a Sacramental presence, limited to the use and action of the Sacrament. When the Sacramental use and action are concluded there is no Sacrament, or Body and Blood of Christ, to be reserved and adored. The course of doctrinal development in England serves to illustrate the fact that when a Protestant Church reaches a purer doctrine she is gravitating towards the original Protestant statement of the Augsburg Confession.

Calvin approached Luther's teaching just in proportion as he discarded Zwinglianism. Hooker followed Calvin, and fifty years ago the great body of the English clergy held to Hooker. Now their teaching is Lutheran, and the hope of the triumph of the truth lies in a faithful maintenance of that position, as the venerable Archbishop's recent decision shows, in connection with his former words.

Canon Perry, author of a standard History of the Church of England, and also of the Article on the Church of England in the Encyclopedia Britannica, says; that owing to the effect produced in England by Luther's writings, already in 1521 measures were taken for the suppression of the growing Lutheranism of Oxford. Some time in August, 1521, there was a public burning, at St. Paul's, of all the Lutheran books which could be collected.

In the same year came Henry's treatise against Luther, in defense of the Seven Sacraments.

Cardinal Wolsey did not go to the same extremes of violence as his King, and refused to cleanse Cambridge of its Lutheranism in 1523.

On the other hand he named as fellows of Cardinal College a band of Cambridge men "who were known to be pronounced Lutherans."

Some of Tyndale's books were burned in 1527, for the rea-

son that Tyndale had been known to be in communication with Luther. As Dr. Jacobs has so fully shown "the theologians of England were keeping abreast of the entire development of theological literature on the Continent." *

Canon Perry further sets forth that the formularies of the English Church, when they are not translations from Latin and Greek rituals, that had been in the Christian Church for more than a thousand years, are taken from the service-book called the Consultation of Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne, 1543. This work was grounded on a book previously published by Luther. The drafts of the Articles of Faith were founded on a paper of articles agreed upon between Cranmer and "certain Lutheran divines who were in England in 1538, with a view of inducing Henry VIII., to adopt the Augsburg Confession. These were drawn as nearly as possible in the terms of the Augsburg Confession, and hence the resemblance between the articles of the Church of England and those of Augsburg." (Encyclopedia Britannica, 9th Ed., Article on the Church of England).

It will thus be seen that the whole of Protestantism has been moulded, in its main doctrines, by the deliverance made at Augsburg in the early days of the Reformation. Protestant thought has been sifting out the fantastic notions of the mystics, rejecting the rationalizing methods of the Reformed schools, seeking a profounder interpretation of Christ's words respecting the two Sacraments, which have been interpreted too literally by Rome, too liberally by Reason.

The Lutheran has the middle-of-the-road doctrine, to which the dissatisfied on both sides may resort when they awake to see on one side their unscriptural use of reason, and on the other side their unreasonable use of Scripture. Like Luther himself, the Church which bears his honored name is convinced only with proofs of Holy Writ, combined with manifest, clear and distinct principles and arguments.

We have no rationalistic interpretation, but a more rational way when we declare that faith is required. Luther reached the kernel of the whole matter when he said: "The Sacra-

*Lutheran Movement in England, p. 13.

ments are not fulfilled by being performed but by being believed."

Faith is required; faith is created; faith is confirmed. The word of God cuts clean, like a two-edged sword, first to create faith in the soul that learns the truth; then to nourish and to strengthen faith in them who use the word and Sacraments as God's means to that end.

The tendency of Rationalism is to empty the Sacraments of the very significance which is claimed as their supreme or only office.

On the other hand, the Romish use of the Sacraments makes them a human means of justification, taking the place of faith.

The Lutheran position exalts the divine agencies; bows before the grace manifested in Christ; believes the promises that proceed from the divine love; associates with the Sacraments in their right use the word of God as the chief means in the salvation of men, since the Word contains our only knowledge of Christ the Redeemer, who is himself designated in the Scriptures as the Word.

Thus the cycle of redemption runs its complete turn.

The word of prophecy has become the word of history in the gospels. Everything connected with Christianity finds its full and final interpretation in Christ the Eternal Logos.

The Sacraments must be so interpreted and used. When they are not, they are denuded by a rationalistic method, leaving the Church only the barren signs, "signifying nothing"; or at most, an absent Christ. By the Romanistic methods they are enriched with magical additions, irrational ceremonies, unscriptural ideas, which tend to subvert the plain teachings of the word of God.

As over against these false or partial methods we set forth the Biblical or Lutheran views, by a paraphrase from Luther.

Rome makes material what God has made spiritual; the Rationalist makes spiritual what God has made material; we take the via media and hold material what God has made material, and spiritual what God has made spiritual.

ARTICLE IV.

LUTHER AND THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

[CONTINUED FROM VOL. XXX., P. 61.]

BY PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D.

LUTHER'S OPINIONS OF THE CONFESSION.

The Confession was read late on Saturday afternoon, June 25th, 1530. The next day Melanchthon wrote to Luther, saying: "Our defense has been presented to the Emperor. I send it to you to read. In my opinion it is sufficiently vehement (satis vehemens").* On the day following, June 27th, he wrote to Veit Dietrich, who was with Luther at Coburg, and said: "We have sent you a copy of the Confession. Keep it by you, so that it be not published. But write me back the Doctor's opinion of it."† June 3rd he wrote again to Dietrich, and said: "I desire to know whether the Doctor is in a better humor, and what he thinks about the Apology."‡

These letters make it perfectly evident that Melanchthon was impatient to learn what Luther thought about the *finished* Confession, which, as we have seen, was very different from the full draft—*Der fertige Entwurf, Prima Adumbratio*—which had been sent, May 11th, since, in the interval of six weeks, several new articles had been added, and many changes had been made in that first draft.

But not only did he wish to know what Luther thought about the Confession; he wished to know also what Luther would think about additional concessions to the enemy, and about certain important subjects of dispute. In the letter of June 26th, he wrote, *inter alia:* "I now think we will have to decide before the enemy makes reply, what we will concede to them. The entire deliberation will be *about both species, about Marriage, about private Mass.* Answer with reference to these things, and es-

*C. R. II., 141. †C. R. II., 147.
‡C. R. II., 158.

pecially with reference to private mass, which our opponents seem utterly unwilling to surrender."

This extract furnishes the proof that Melanchthon did not regard the Confession as the Protestant ultimatum, nor consider that the negotiations with the Catholics were closed. He looked on the Confession as the first step in the direction of the attainment of that harmony with the Church which had been broken by the Wittenberg movement, and which the Saxons especially were seeking to restore. And the sequel shows that he was altogether correct in his prophecy as to the subjects of future deliberation—subjects that do not so much concern the articles of *doctrine*, but belong chiefly to the matters which the Confession itself had catalogued under "the abuses which have been corrected." The doctrine is supposed to be "Christian and comforting," and "not opposed to the Scriptures, nor to the Catholic Church, nor to the Roman Church, in so far as it is known from writers." The questions at issue, as Melanchthon conceived the situation, and as subsequent negotiations showed, almost wholly concerned certain institutions of the Roman Catholic Church. It was thought that if an understanding could be reached in regard to these "abuses," peace and harmony would be reëstablished in the Catholic Church, of which the Protestants claimed to be members. One object had in view by Melanchthon in sending the finished Confession to Luther, and in writing the accompanying letter, was to draw Luther out on the subject of further concessions; and another object was to get his opinion on the abuses named The letter and the copy of the Confession reached Coburg, June 29th. Luther replied immediately, saying: "I have received your Apology, and I wonder what you mean by asking what and how much must be conceded to the Papists. As touching the Prince it is a different question, as to what he is to concede, if danger threatens him. So far as I am concerned, more than enough has been already conceded in that Apology. If they refuse that, I do not see what more I can concede, unless their reasons and writings should appear clearer to me than I have hitherto seen them. I am occupied day and night in this matter, thinking, revolving, discussing,

searching the Scriptures. Confidence in our doctrine grows upon me. I am more and more confirmed, so that, God willing, I will allow nothing more to be taken from me, come what may."*

In his letter of June 26th, Melanchthon had written also: "In these momentous concerns we follow your authority." To this Luther makes reply as follows: "I am displeased that in your letter you write that in this matter you follow my authority. I am unwilling to be or to be called your authority in this matter. Even though the word might be properly interpreted, nevertheless I do not desire it. If the matter be not at the same time equally yours, I am unwilling that it should be called mine, and should be imposed on you. If it were solely mine, I myself would act."†

This letter of Luther's, the salient points of which we have quoted, is clear and incisive.

1. What Melanchthon regards as "sufficiently vehement," Luther regards as too conciliatory,—as having conceded *too much* to the enemy. Hence his opinion of the Confession as expressed in this letter is not *unqualifiedly* approbatory. There can be no doubt that it would have pleased him better, had it been more decidedly anti-Romish, and there can be no doubt that had Luther been at Augsburg, and had been allowed to take part in its composition, the Confession would have been less conciliatory—more *Lutheran* and more positively aggressive against Rome than it is. To verify this conclusion one has only to read Luther's writings, his letter yet to be quoted, and the complaints of the Romanists that the Confession did not fairly represent Luther's teaching.‡

2. The letter shows that Luther is fixed in his determination to allow nothing additional to be wrested from him. The Elector may do, under the circumstances, what he pleases. But Luther has resolved to make no more concessions. In the

*DeWette, IV., 62.
†DeWette, IV., 62.
‡See Ficker, *Die Konfutation*, p. 40; Cochleus, *Vermanung*, E., II.

common cause *too many* concessions have been already made. The conviction grows upon him that his teaching is scriptural.

3. He is not willing that the men at Augsburg shall shift the responsibility from themselves, and place it upon him. It is a common cause in which they are engaged. The men at Augsburg are not to take refuge under his authority. They must meet the foe in their own name.

From the position so emphatically taken in this letter Luther made no recession. In his subsequent letters during the Diet, in reference both to the Confession and to the negotiations going on there, we find no deviation from the sentiments expressed in this letter. Some of his references to the Confession are decidedly *qualified*, and his protests against the spirit of compromise at Augsburg, and against the concessions made there, are clear and unequivocal, so that we may say truthfully that with this letter of June 29th begins Luther's real influence in determining matters on the Protestant side at Augsburg, that is, it may be truthfully said that from this time on Luther directs his party at Augsburg, and helps to shape the conclusions that are *finally* reached, so that Professor Maurenbrecker, in treating of the portion of the Diet's history now under review, is fully justified in saying: "Luther's letters nerved and strengthened the resolution of the Protestant Princes, and helped to bring back to the theological spokesman (Melanchthon) in Augsburg, the Protestant consciousness, that in time, had vacillated and hesitated. But for Luther's heroic interposition, who knows that the proceeding at Augsburg would not have had a very lamentable ending." *

July 3rd Luther wrote again to Melanchthon, saying: "Yesterday I read your Apology diligently. It pleases very much. But it errs and sins in one thing which operates against Holy Scripture, where Christ says in regard to himself: *We will not have this man rule over us*, and it strikes upon that condemnation: *The stone which the builders rejected.* Where there is so much darkness and blindness, what can you expect, but to be

**Geschichte der Katholischen Reformation*, p. 305. Maurenbrecker was Professor of History at Bonn, and then at Leipzig. Died in 1892.

rejected? They will not concede to us the name of builders. This they claim for themselves, and justly. We ought to glory in the name of destroyers, scatterers, dissipators, since we are classed with the wicked, and that stone itself is classed with robbers, and is condemned." *

Some persons would see only irony in this extract, except in the second sentence. But a person who does not have a theory to defend will see in the second sentence, "It pleases very much," a strong expression of approbation couched in general terms, and in what follows a particular criticism, and then, irony. The interpretation given to this extract by those very capable scholars and strenuous Lutherans, Calinisch and Knaake, cannot be impugned. "It is evident," say they, "that here he (Luther) repeats the stricture, previously indicated, viz., that Melanchthon had not included the article *de Antichristo Papa.*"†

This interpretation is fully sustained by what Luther wrote to Justus Jonas, July 27th: "I now understand the meaning of those demands for more articles. Satan, forsooth, still lives, and he knows very well that apologiam vestram *Leisetreterin* dissimulasse articulos de purgatorio, de sanctorum cultu, et maxime de Antichristo Papa. Miserable Emperor, if he appointed this Diet for the purpose of hearing Luther's replies, as though they did not have enough to answer in the present Apology."‡

There is no mistaking the meaning of *Leisetreterin* in this connection. Luther applies it here as an opprobrious epithet, and no German scholar understands it as merely the equivalent of "softly-stepping."§ Besides, this "Apologia vestra *Leisetreterin* dissembles, hides, conceals (*dissimulasse*), the articles in regard to purgatory, the worship of saints, and especially in re-

*De Wette, IV., 68.

†*Luther und die Augsburg. Confession, p. 57; Luther's Anthiel., p. 78.*

‡De Wette, IV., 110.

§Flügel defines *Leisetreter*, the masculine, as, "sneaking fellow, spy, eaves-dropper." Grieb: "Spy, eaves-dropper, a sneak, sneaking fellow." Grimm's Wörtenbuch: Der vorsichtig auftritt gewendet auf einen menchen, der um seines vortheils willen nirgens anzustoszen strebt. Luther associates the *Leisetreter* with the insolent spirits and hypocritical priests (heuchelpfaffen). Grimm, *sub voce.*

gard to the Pope as Antichrist." Luther would have had the Confession moves as an open and aggressive force, and include articles against the assumptions of the Pope, and against the idolatry contained in the Roman Catholic Church. But at the same time Luther recognizes the fact that the Confession contains more—and this was and remains its glory—than the Papists could answer. And as to his determination to resist further concessions, that is evidenced by the letter which he wrote to Melanchthon, July 13th: "For my part I will not yield a hair, nor suffer it to be yielded. Rather will I await every calamity, since they are proceeding so obstinately."* He declares that Christ and Belial cannot be reconciled. since the chief contention is about *doctrines*. "The Pope is opposed to reconciliation, and Luther begs to be excused."† Indeed, his letters of July and August show with absolute conclusiveness that Luther regarded reeonciliation as impossible, and as undesirable. And he constantly insisted that his friends at Augsburg should make no additional concessions. But his instructions were not heeded as they should have been, and as a consequence the historian has to record at this point one of the most humiliating chapters connected with the entire history of Lutheranism, viz.: that of the so-called *Compromissversuche*.

But before we proceed to record the concessions made by the Evangelicals at Augsburg during July and August, we must recite other opinions of Luther as touching the Confession.

July 6th Luther wrote to Conrad Cordatus as follows: "By order of the Emperor it (the Confession) was produced and read before the whole Empire, that is, before the Princes and Estates of the Empire. I am exceedingly glad that I have lived to this hour, in which Christ has been preached publicly by his illustrious confessors in such a large assembly in such a very beautiful Confession."‡

On the same day Luther published an open letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Mayence, of whom he had just written to Nicholas Hausmann: "Moguntinus valde praedicatur pacis

*De Wette, IV., 88. †See De Wette, IV., 85, 88, 114.
‡De Wette, IV., 71.

studiosus." It is hard to characterize this letter. Judged by our democratic standards it sounds sycophantic. But we dare not apply our standards to the etiquette of the sixteenth century. The letter allots to Albert all the grand titles of his birth and offices, as, "Most Reverend Father in God, Most Illustrious Prince and Lord, Lord Albert, Cardinal Priest of St. Chrysogonus, Primate in Germany, Administrator in Halberstadt, Margrave in Brandenburg etc., My Most Gracious Lord," and addresses him as "Most Reverend, Most Illustrious, High-born Prince, Most Gracious Lord"; but it exhibits Luther's wonted bitterness against the Pope, and his determination to stand fast in his teaching, because it is the teaching of God's word.

After briefly reciting the reasons why the letter is to be sent, not in manuscript, but in printed form, published, the writer proceeds as follows: "I humbly pray Your Electoral Princely Grace graciously to receive this my letter. Since Your Electoral Princely Grace is the chief and highest Prelate in Germany, and can do more than any one else, I have risen above my scruples, and address Your Electoral Princely Grace most humbly in this letter, in order that I may do my full part, and acquit my conscience before God and the world; and if misfortune and God's wrath should follow (as I dreadfully fear), that I may be without blame, as one who has sought in every way to promote, and has offered peace.

"Doubtless you and all the others heard the Confession presented by ours. I have the comforting assurance that it has been so composed that it may joyfully say with Christ, its Lord (John 18 : 23): 'If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil, but if well, why smitest thou me?' It shuns not the light, but can say with the Psalmist: 'I will speak of thy testimonies before kings, and shall not be ashamed.' Whoever does the truth comes to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God.

"On the contrary I can easily conceive that our enemies will not accept this doctrine. Much less will they be able to refute it. I have no hope that we will be united in doctrine. They have become so embittered, and enraged, that they would go

into hell—which stands open for them—rather than yield to us, and forsake their own wisdom. We must let them go. We are innocent of their blood. I write to you because I know that our opponents cannot refute our doctrine. By the Confession we clearly show that we have not taught erroneously and falsely."*

On the ground that the doctrine contained in the Confession, and held by the Lutherans, is true and Scriptural, Luther pleads with the Archbishop to exert himself to the end that the Lutherans be not further persecuted, but be *let alone.* He does not seek dogmatic nor practical union with the Catholics—for of this he sees no hope—but *peace* in separation. He points to the Confession as evidence that the Lutheran doctrine is not heretical.

July 9th Luther wrote to the Elector of Saxony as follows: "The enemy thought they had accomplished something when by command of the Emperor they had the preaching suppressed. But the miserable people did not perceive that by the written Confession that was delivered, there was more preaching than ten preachers could probably have done. Isn't it a fine piece of wisdom and a good joke that when Master Eisleben and ours were silenced, the Elector of Saxony rose up with the Confession and preached under the very noses of the Emperor and of the whole Empire, so that they had to hear and could not reply. * * * Christ was not silenced in the Diet, and in their madness they had to hear from the Confession more than they could have heard in a year from the preachers."†

July 9th he wrote to Justus Jonas: "The first and greatest thing is that Christ was proclaimed by a public and glorious confession, and set forth openly in their presence, so that they cannot boast that we fled, or were frightened, or concealed our faith. It grieves me that I am not present at this beautiful confession."‡

July 20th he wrote to Melanchthon: "I am deeply grieved

*De Wette, IV., p. 72, *et seqq.* †De Wette, IV., 82.
‡Ibid., 85.

that I cannot be with you personally in this most beautiful confession of Christ." *

An examination of the original makes it evident at once that by "public and glorious confession," "beautiful confession," "most beautiful confession," Luther refers not to the written Confession, but to the heroic act of confessing Christ in the midst of those whom Luther regarded as the enemies of Christ. Yet that Luther regarded the written Confession with high favor, that he joyfully confessed that it contained the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, that in later years he called it *his* Confession†—all this is abundantly evident. But that he also regarded it as *too mild*, as having *conceded too much*, as lacking at least three important articles, that he called it *Apologia Leisctreterin*,—and he is not known to have revoked these strictures,—all this is documentarily certain. It is a misfortune, it is also a fact, that historians have fixed their eyes too exclusively on Luther's letter of May 15th to the Elector‡—"I have read over Master Philip's Apology. It pleases me very well,"—and on that of July 9th to the Elector,§ and have overlooked, or glozed the "plus satis cessum in ista Apologia"|| and the "Scilicet Satan adhuc vivit et bene sensit apologiam vestram *Leisetreterin* dissimulasse articulos de purgatorio, de Sanctorum cultu, et maxime de Antichristo Papa."¶ The full purview, which can be obtained only by reading all that Luther wrote in regard to the Confession shows indisputably, that Luther's approbation of the Confession *was not unqualified.* His approbation is expressed in general terms, but in several instances it is accompanied by strictures more or less severe There is no evidence that he regarded it as a law for the conscience, or thought that it had spoken the last word on any article of the Christian faith, or that he ever thought of binding himself and others to the letter, or to the form of the Confession. Otherwise he could not have counselled and approved the changes made in the Confession by Melanchthon in the edition of 1540.**

*Ibid., 103. †Walch, XXII., 1532.
‡De Wette, IV., 17. §Ibid., IV., 82.
||Ibid., IV., 52. ¶De Wette, IV., 109, 110.
**See *Lutheran Quarterly* for October, 1898, p. 569 *et seqq.*

The historian must exhibit all the known facts. Had Luther written the Confession he would have made it stronger and sharper in its protest against Rome. He would have put into it something of the energy that appears in every line of the Schmalkald Articles. But as it is, it is *Lutheran* and not un-Lutheran, and both in form and content deserves to be known, and will always be known, as the Fundamental Confession of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

PROTESTANT CONCESSIONS AT AUGSBURG.

The attitude of Melanchthon at Augsburg was out-and-out apologetic and conciliatory; and in this attitude he was but the concrete enbodiment of the spirit that animated and pervaded the Saxon count when it made ready to obey the Imperial summons to Augsburg, and as it demeaned itself during the Diet.* If he went too far in his negotiations for peace, and for reconciliation with the Roman Catholic Church (as we believe he did), that was not alone because of his peace-loving disposition, but in great part also because he was the surrogate and spokesman of his party, and knew the will of his masters, though he would have made larger concessions had he not been restrained by the counsellors,† that is, we may suppose, by the Saxon chancellors, and posibly by some of the other theologians.

It was in the spirit of concession, as well as because of per-

*See Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., p. 40 *et passim;* C. R. II., 301, 311, 314, 339.

†C. R. II., 140. Melanchthon wrote to Luther, August 25th: "Were I engaged in these negotiations in my own name, not in that of the Prince, I would not tolerate this insolence [of the Catholics]. Under the circumstances, the perils of the Princes, the dangers to the state, the wills of ours either marvelously weak, or not brave at the right place, compel me to dissemble (dissimulare) everything." And on the next day again to Luther: "Sometimes they (the Romanists) add the most atrocious threats. Hence though I do not regard my own peril, yet I sometimes consider that there is great weakness of purpose (imbecilitas animi) in our leaders." C. R. II., 311, 314. The facts show indisputably that Melanchthon, in the *Nachgiebigkeit* with which he is often charged, was but carrying out the will of his masters, who nowhere find fault with his concessions, nor with his efforts to restore peace and concord.

sonal preference for episcopal government, that he "rendered entire jurisdiction to the bishops."* In one of his interviews with Valdesius, an Imperial Secretary, he is reported by the Nurenberg Legates as saying that "the Lutheran contention is not so prolix and troublesome as has been probably reported to the Emperor. It consists chiefly in the following articles: Both forms in the Sacrament, marriage of the pastors and monks, and the Mass, inasmuch as Lutherans do not approve of private masses. He thought that if agreement could be reached in regard to these articles, a satisfactory adjustment could be effected."†

The suggestions made by Melanchthon to Valdesius pleased the Emperor, and, in part, also, Cardinal Campeggius, the papal Legate.‡ And at the request of Valdesius Melanchthon agreed to compose a statement of the points at issue. The object in view was the settlement of the dispute *in einer Enge und Stille*, so that the Confession that had been prepared might not be delivered, and that a public discussion might be avoided."§ And that Melanchthon had hopes of a peaceable settlement of the existing difficulties, and of the removal of misunderstandings, and that he earnestly desired peace, is shown by his letters.‖ Even John Brentz had reported to his friend Isenmann as follows: Conscripsimus enim auctore *Philippo Melanchthone* epitomen doctrinae nostrae, idque valde civile et modeste. In ea petunt principes, ut amice controversia componatur, et pax restituatur.¶

The document and the letters from which we have quoted exhibit the mind of Melanchthon, of Brentz, and of the Princes, *prior* to the reading of the Confession before the Emperor. Even in the Preface to the Confession the Lutherans declare that they are ready to consult on friendly terms about possible methods and means of coming to an agreement so far as it could be done with honor. No sooner is the Confession read

*C. R. II., 119.
†C. R. II., 122.
‡C. R. II., 123.
§C. R. II., 112, 113.
‖C. R. II., 118, 119.
¶C. R. II., 124.

than Melanchthon inquires of Luther, as we have learned already, "how much can we concede to the enemy," and expresses the opinion that the future discussion will be confined to both species in the Eucharist, to the marriage of the priests, and to private masses, especially to the last named.* The inference is that Melanchthon supposed,—and the sequel shows that he was substantially correct in his supposition,—that in all other points he had stated the Lutheran doctrine "in closest possible proximation to the Catholic doctrines."† And that both he and others were willing to make larger concessions, will soon appear. Hence the Confession was not regarded as the Protestant *ultimatum*, nor "as a permanent and immutable standard of faith, but simply as the assertion of a fact, 'Our churches teach'—'it is taught,' "‡ and it was for this reason that immediately it became, and for a long time was employed as, a Vergleichungsformel, that is, as a formula for a comparison of views between the two contending parties and as the basis for the well known *Kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen.*

And that a desire for peace and reconciliation very generally pervaded the Protestant camp, is abundantly evident. July 4th Andrew Osiander wrote to Winceslaus Link and Master Schleupner, as follows: "There is no one that does not desire that this matter be settled on just and Christian conditions, except some petty German Bishops, petty tyrants and pseudo-theologasters, who rage and thirst only for blood."§ When the Electors of Mayence and Brandenburg offered to mediate for the settlement of the schism between the Protestants and the Emperor, the Saxon Elector exclaimed: "It is not the will of God that we should have a schism with the Emperor, for he summoned this Diet exactly that we might be one in regard to the faith, and for this we are entirely ready."‖ Philip of Hesse, immediately after hearing the Papal Confutation read, told Melanchthon, "that for the sake of preserving peace, he would ac-

*C. R. II., 141, 146.
†Ranke, *History of the Reformation*, V., IX.
‡Ibid. See also Moeller's *Hist. Chr. Ch.* III., 106–7.
§C. R. II., 163.
‖Pfaff's *Geschichte*, I., 308. Plitt's *Apologie der Augustana*, p. 45.

cept even harder conditions, though he could not allow contempt for the gospel." *

July 6th Melanchthon, under instruction from the Princes, wrote Cardinal Campeggius that the Princes, "so far as conscience will permit promise distinctly to accept such conditions as he (the Cardinal) shall judge necessary to the maintenance, confirmation and ratification of peace and concord, the authority and order of the Church. And they affirm that they do not by any means wish to overthrow the order of the Church and the authority of the bishops." He even went so far as to write: "If a few things are condoned, or concealed, concord can be established, provided the Catholics will allow both species and will tolerate the marriage of the priests and monks." † He also promised on the part of the princes entire obedience to the bishops. He even held a personal interview with Campeggius, and reported that the Cardinal had said "that he could grant the use of both species, and the marriage of priests; but that no dispensation could be made in regard to the monks, inasmuch as the Keys do not err." He also sent to the Cardinal nine "conditions" to be conceded by the Catholics. In the first condition he says "The Roman Church will not act contrary to her clemency if she should allow us the use of both species of the Sacrament, since we do not condemn others, and confess that in the species of the bread the true body of Christ is contained, or by concomitance, the blood, and therefore the whole Christ; in the species of the wine likewise the whole Christ. And this thing seems to increase respect for the Sacrament, and the piety of the people, who prefer to use the entire Sacrament."

Several conditions treat of the marriage of the clergy, and affirm that the difficulties connected with the matter "can be settled according to the canons, after the Bishops shall have recovered obedience." In the seventh he says: "As touching the Mass, we retain the public ceremonies, though not the full number. If the other things can be arranged, I do not doubt that the controversy about the Mass can be settled. Certainly

*C. R. II., 254. †C. R. II., 142–3.

it is profitable for the Church to have this ceremony piously observed, and with us it is most piously observed. For those always take the body of Christ who have confessed and have been absolved." In the eighth condition it is said that "the controversies about meats and the like things are trifling. When obedience and ecclesiastical jurisdiction shall have been restored to the Bishops, the rest can be settled. Ours do not hesitate to obey the Bishops, if only they will receive us. Hitherto the priests have been wretchedly tortured about marrying, and the like. Now that that peril is removed, they will cheerfully obey." In the ninth it is said: "Your Reverend Lordship can without much difficulty establish peace and concord his tam paucis rebus vel dissimulatis vel relaxatis."*

Coelestin says that Melanchthon drew up these "conditions" "for the purpose of showing the papal legate, Campeggius, that he and his colleagues were most anxious for peace and harmony."†

We cannot but stand amazed before such "conditions." They involve a full return to the theology of the Middle Ages and to the government of the Church by Rome, The doctrine of *Concomitance* is inseparable from the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and *totus Christus in qualibet specie* is the very language of the Roman Catholic teaching.‡ Grant this "condition," and you grant the principle on which alone the Church of Rome can justify the Communion under one kind. The wonder is that the Romanists did not concede this point. Only the blindness and stubbornness born of the determination to enforce submission in everything, could have closed their eyes to the advantage of this Protestant "condition;" for had this "condition" been granted,

*C. R. II., 246–8.

†*Historia*, III., 19. The Nurenberg Legates write August 23: "We find that the Saxon and the Margrave have finally become very anxious for reconciliation and agreement. What influences them to this, we do not know. God grant that it may be with a good conscience." C. R. II., 301, 322.

‡Compare Denziger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, Editio, VII., p. 163: Totus Christus continetur sub spccie panis et totus sub specie vini. Also p. 158: Integrum Christi corpus et Sanguinem tam sub specie panis, quam sub specie vini veraciter contineri. See Index, p. 468.

the Reformation would have been doomed, since many of its leaders would have accepted the concession, and would have submitted to the jurisdiction of the Bishops, that is, to Bishops appointed by the Pope, and subject to the authority of the Pope, and who does not see that submission to such Bishops would have been speedily followed by the full restoration of the papal government of the churches? And that the Protestants—at least those more especially represented by Melanchthon—were sincere in this matter of submission, under the "conditions," is further shown by what Melanchthon wrote in his *Concilium de Concordia Facienda:* "We pray that both species and the marriage of the clergy be permitted us. In other things we will hold about as they do. If they bring on a discussion about the Mass, we must not decline it. If they do not forbid us both species and the marriage of the priests, then our forma ecclesiae remains so [that is, in accord with the system of Rome]. Hence I think we ought to attend to these two things. If both species be again forbidden, then great offenses will come, so that many persons will not commune, as has been hitherto the case in some places. We cannot approve such an inhibition." He further says: "I think the Emperor will not dispute about the doctrine. All of our articles have been conceded by them in the Confutation, but they have attached many calumnies.

"I do not think it possible to restore the Mass. Hence let the Emperor issue an order about it. There will be few among us who know how to hold private masses." *

The *Conditiones* and the *Concilium* were both written *after* the reading of the *Papal Confutation*, August 3rd. They show only too plainly that Melanchthon and those whom he represented, —chiefly the Elector and Margrave George, and their respective counsellors and theologians,—no longer had any particular dispute with the Romanists about *doctrines*, but only about ceremonies and human institutions; † and the sequel will show that the Romanists are no longer much concerned about difference

*C. R. II., 269. Written about August 11th or 12th.
†See Plitt, *Apologie der Augustana.*

in doctrines, or about the Protestant *doctrinal* teaching, but about ceremonies.

Such *status quo* of the parties at that particular time can be accounted for only by the fact that the Confession was composed "in the undeniable intention of approximating as closely as possible to the Catholic doctrines,"* and that the Protestants meant literally what they said in Article XXI: "It (the Confession) contains nothing that is discrepant from the Scriptures, or from the Catholic Church, or from the Church of Rome, in so far as it is known from writers," and that this declaration was accepted by the Romanists in good faith.

THE COMMITTEE OF FOURTEEN.

From the beginning of the Diet, the Archbishop of Mayence, the highest ecclesiastical dignitary of Germany, had been favorably disposed toward the Protestants. The same is true of Bishop von Stadion of Augsburg, who is reported to have said on hearing the Confession read: "That is true, and we cannot deny it." C. R. II., 154. These two, together with the Elector of Brandenburg, Duke Henry of Brunswick, Duke George of Pomerania, Duke Albert of Mecklenburg, and some others, formed the so-called middle party, that sought to mediate between the more violent Catholics and the Protestants. Negotiations looking to a peaceable settlement of the existing controversy and strife were begun about the fifth of August, and were continued for several days.† On the seventh some of the Catholic party grew violent, rnd threatened that "unless the Elector should renounce and abjure the Lutheran doctrine, the Emperor would subdue him with an army, would deprive him of his rank, possessions and even of life, and would subjugate all his subjects, with their wives and children, to his own faith."‡ Coelestin says that "this violent and harsh speech frightened the Elector almost as though he had been stunned by a thunderbolt, and that returning home he could by no means conceal it from his

*Ranke, V., ix.; Möller's *Hist. Chr. Ch.*, III., 106–7.
†Förstmann, II., 180 *et seqq.;* Cyprian, p. 79.
‡Coelestin, III., 26b.

theologians, but declared that unless he should renounce and abjure the known truth of the pure doctrine, he would be attacked with hostile violence, and overwhelmed, and hence that he would bring, not only himself, but his subjects, into extreme peril and distress." *

When in the afternoon the parties came together again, "the evangelical orders responded about as follows: We have heard what you have proposed as a means of reconciliation, and, laying aside every other proposition, and diligently considering this, we are able to make only this reply: If the administration of the Sacrament under both species, the marriage of our priests, and the Masses with the ceremonies that have existed among us, be left free to us, until something certain can be decided and determined about all these things in a general council, we will cheerfully yield and obey in all other things." They conclude by saying that "as far as can be done, let Christian concord and a certain iniformity in the Church, in doctrine, and in ceremonies, everywhere prevail and be preserved." †

Here again the entire controversy is reduced to three points, not one of which can be strictly said to involve a *doctrine*;‡ for the *administratio sacramenti sub utraque specie* does not so much concern the *doctrine* of the Sacrament, the validity and efficacy of the Sacrament, but only the completeness of its use. The marriage of the Priests had been all along urged on ethical, rather than on doctrinal, grounds. And up even to this time the Mass had been celebrated among the Protestants with the *Elevation*, though not with the adoration, of the host. That is, *doctrine* has passed completely into the background, so that it is not *now* a subject of dispute between the parties. The Protestants contend *now* chiefly against certain unwarranted institutions of the Roman Catholic Church. One cannot but wonder what has become of Part I. of the Confession, in which it had been so often declared that such and such "doctrines are

*Coelestin, III., 26b.

†Ibid.

‡Tota dissentio est de paucis quibusdam abusibus, said Melanchthon in the Confession as delivered to the Emperor, C. R. XXVI., 291, n. 55, Ibid. 251.

taught in our churches." Was the *distinctive* character of these doctrines now to be suppressed? Or was the Catholic party to be left under the impression that those doctrines are taught and preached in the Protestant churches in harmony with the interpretation of Rome? And what shall we say about the promise of complete and absolute submission to the jurisdiction of the Bishops appointed by the Pope and subject to his domination?

It is easy to see that a compromise on such terms would have resulted in the annihilation of the Reformation; and the Lutheran Church would have been strangled in the hour of her birth. Her doctrines, as we shall have reason to conclude from what presently transpired, would, under Roman Catholic jurisdiction, have been interpreted in a Roman Catholic sense, and the "abuses corrected" would have been soon forgotten; or had the corrections survived in the memories of men, they could have furnished no motive for a religious reformation, and no foundation for an abiding ecclesiastical superstructure. It was the *doctrines* of the Confession, as they received a *Protestant*, and an *evangelical* interpretation, that have established the Lutheran Church. Finally, August 13th, the Protestants proposed that a committee consisting of an equal number of persons from both sides, be appointed, "who in charity, forbearance and moderation, should treat of the controverted articles, and especially of those things which are preached in the Church." * The next day, Sunday, August 14th, the Emperor appointed a committee of fourteen persons, seven on each side, "to consult and to treat in a kind and friendly way about the affairs of religion, and about the possibility of reaching an agreement. On each side there were to be two princes, two counsellors, and two theologians, who were to begin negotiations on Tuesday after the assumption of Mary. On the side of the Papists the following were appointed: Duke Henry, of Brunswick and the Bishop of Augsburg; the Chancellors of Cologne and Baden; Doctors John Eck, Conrad Wimpina and John Cochleus. On the side of the Protestants the following: Duke John Frederick of Saxony, and the Margrave of Brandenburg; Doctors

*Coelestin III., 36; Chytraeus (Latin), 231; Müller, 741.

Gregory Brück and Sebastian Heller; Philip Melanchthon, John Brentz and Erhard Schnepf." *

Both sides began immediately to make ready for the work of the joint committee. The Catholics instructed Dr. John Eck to prepare "an opinion on each article of the Confession" and to present "a plan and means by which the controverted articles might be reconciled."† Eck's "Opinion" on the first twenty-one articles of the Confession is as follows:

"1. The first article, of the unity of essence and the trinity of persons, agrees with the Church.

"2. Article second, of original sin, agrees with the Church, but in defining what original sin is, it differs from the Church. A medium course would be for them to say that the inborn concupiscence is original sin before baptism, but after baptism it is a consequence, or punishment, of original sin, but not sin.

"3. Article third, of Christ Jesus, agrees.

"4. Article fourth agrees with the Church in that we cannot be justified by our own powers; but it disagrees in that it ascribes justification to faith, and denies our merits. They would agree if they would ascribe justification to faith working by love, as St. Paul teaches, Gal. 5. But they ought to drop the word *sola*, because the plain people are deceived, when they, excluding grace and faith, say that faith alone justifies.

"In regard to merits they would agree, if they should decide that works in their own nature, and of themselves, are not meritorious, but only because of God's mercy and grace, assisting, going before and coöperating. Thus God rewards the labors of his saints.

"5. Article fifth agrees, namely, that the Holy Spirit is given by the Sacraments as by means. But faith and merits may be treated as in article fourth.

*Schirrmacher, pp. 111, 112; Coelestin, III., 42 b; Chytraeus (Latin), p. 238; Müller, *Historie*, pp. 742-3. C. R., 311, 312. When a few days later Henry of Brunswick went in pursuit of Philip of Hesse, who left Augsburg secretly, August 6th (C. R. II., 263; Schirrmacher, p. 189), Duke George of Saxony was placed on the Committee, Colestin, III., 42b.

†Coelestin, III., 36a.

"6. Article sixth agrees, namely, that faith brings forth good work with charity. Of faith as above.

"7. Article seventh disagrees, because they say that the Church consists of the good, whereas there are in it both good and bad. It would agree, if they would say that the Church consists of the holy, just as we also say that the Church is holy by reason of the holiness of faith, of the Sacraments, of graces and gifts. The name comes from the more important part, provided the good predominate, even though they admit ungodly ministers into the Church.

"8. Article eighth, of ungodly ministers, agrees.

"9. Likewise article ninth.

"10. Article tenth agrees as regards the true doctrine (*de veritate*) of the Eucharist, but it must not be extended to both elements [that is, both elements must not be administered to the laity.]

"11. Article eleventh agrees in regard to absolution, but not in regard to confession. See Part 2, Article 4.

"12. Article twelfth agrees in regard to the repetition of penance. It differs in regard to the parts of penance. It could be reconciled, because with the Church they teach contrition. But our adversaries and we teach faith. They regard faith as a part of penance. We say that faith is not a part of penance, but that faith is presupposed as the foundation. Hence the dispute is verbal, rather than real. They admit confession and regard it as the Church does, as the second part of penance. Moreover we regard satisfaction as the third part of penance. They confess that good works ought to follow as fruits. Here again the difference is verbal, not real.

"13. Article thirteenth agrees with the Church.

"14. Article fourteenth agrees in words, but differs in practice, since they do not call curates and preachers according to the common law, or according to the appointments of the bishop, which would be the proper call.

"15. Article fifteenth agrees in the chief thing. In regard to the traditions see last article.

"16. Article sixteenth agrees in regard to the civil magistrate.

"17. Article seventeenth agrees in regard to the coming of Christ.

"18. Article eighteenth agrees in regard to free will.

"19. Article nineteenth agrees with the Church in regard to the cause of sin.

"20. Article twentieth, of faith and works, only excuses the preachers. Therefore it is not to be rejected, provided it is taught as in the fourth article.

"21. Article twenty-first, of the worship of saints, differs. Here there are three things: The Veneration of the saints, our Invocation of the saints, the Intercession of the saints for us. The Lutherans admit the veneration. They reject the other two. The intercession of the saints is admitted by the Sacramentarians. Here harmony is not probable, unless they confess with the Church, since a living person may call upon a living one, a mortal upon a mortal, a sinner upon a sinner, a beggar upon a beggar, why may he not call upon an immortal, a righteous one, one free from sin, rich in grace, in goodness, in compassion, and deeply interested in our welfare?"

After a brief discussion of Part II. of the Confession, Eck says: "In a word, articles difficult of reconciliation, and not acceptable to the Church, are:

"Of the Worship of Saints.

"Of Communion under both Kinds.

"Of the Marriage of Priests.

"Of Monastic Vows.

"Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

"Of Human Institutions.

"I think all the difficulty lies in these six points. Whatever difficulty there is in the other articles can be easily settled and removed by a committee of two Princes and two learned men from each side."*

August 15th the Saxon theologians presented to the Elector and other adherents of the Augsburg Confession, a *Bedenken* on the subject of concord. *Es lautete ungemein freidlich*, says

*Schirrmacher, p. 203, *et seqq.;* Coelestin, III., 36a, *et seqq;* Chytraeus (Latin), pp. 232 *et seqq;* Wiedemann's *Dr. Johann Eck*, p. 593.

Plitt.* It opens as follows: "It is our humble opinion that the Princes ought to seek out all means and ways to preserve a permanent peace, and to prevent injury to the country and to the people. We cannot answer before God if we persist in an unnecessary schism.

"We see that daily the people are becoming more wanton, that erring sects are increasing, and that—which may God forbid—war is threathened, which may overthrow both the Church and the Empire. Such important matters should be carefully considered.

"If the Princes have neglected these proper means, they are responsible for all slaughters, etc. They are negligent in regard to the blessings that may follow, viz., that the doctrine of justification, and of the Gospel of Christ, may come to many millions of persons by whom Christ may be glorified. [Here follow four lines in Latin, which, because of some omission by a transscriber, are unintelligible].

"It is of the greatest importance that discipline be practiced in Church and school, lest the people become rude and heathenish. But now no proper discipline can be either established or maintained while this schism lasts. It were better to become Jews and to live with discipline, even though some practice evil, than to become heathenish and wild, since God preferred the Jews to the heathen.

"Therefore we most humbly pray the Princes, for God's sake and for their own welfare, to strive to make peace, and see to it that should the enemy become too harsh, our consciences may be easier. God grant that the delinquency may not be with us."

After some further preliminary discussion the theologians name four conditions, from which, they say, they cannot depart:

"1. That the doctrine of faith, works and Christian freedom, as it has hitherto existed among us, shall be preached according to the Confession.

"2. That both forms of the sacrament be given to the laity.

"3. That it be not required to restore Private Masses, as the

**Apologie der Augustana*, p. 50.

opposite party has hitherto held them, making them an offering for the forgiveness of the sins of the living and the dead.

"4. That marriage be left free to the Priests and to other ministers."

They concede to the Bishops full jurisdiction in spiritual matters, "as in affairs of marriage, and of the ban for the punishment of open sins, but not in matters pertaining to civil government." Of the Pope they say: "Though the Pope is Antichrist, yet we may be subject to him as the Jews were subject to Pharaoh in Egypt, and subsequently were subject to Caiaphas. But the pure doctrine must be allowed us."*

Eck's "Opinion" and the *Bedenken* of the Saxon theologians formed the foci towards which the discussions of the committee centered, though there were numerous deflections, from both sides, in the direction of a closer approximation.

MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE.

Tuesday, August 16th, in the afternoon, the Committee of Fourteen met at the *Rathhaus*. George Spalatin was chosen to act as secretary. In settling the preliminaries of the proceedings, the Chancellor of Baden and the Chancellor of Electoral Saxony were the chief speakers. It was mutually agreed that the discussion be conducted amicably; that the conclusions of the Committee were not to be regarded as a final transaction, but were to be referred to the Emperor; that nothing was to be considered that was opposed to the Catholic Faith, or to the common custom; that the opposing party should conform to the response of the Emperor as to the Holy Scriptures and to the Church, and that the proceedings should not be divulged, except to those interested.

*Schirrmacher, pp. 287 *et seqq.*; In a somewhat fuller text in C. R. II., 281 *et seqq.*; Förstemann (who erroneously dates it August 18th), II., 244 *et seqq.* Latin in Coelestin, III., 31, and in Chytraeus, 236–7. Chancellor Brück wrote on the margin with his own hand: "I am in doubt about this. Since we say that the Pope is Antichrist, on account of his enormous sins, how can we with a good conscience reverence Antichrist, and practice his abuses? If this be done, the Pope is not opposed to us. If we are subject to his tyranny, that doesn't matter. But he claims and defends the primacy *jure divino*." C. R. II., 284, *margin*.

These preliminaries agreed upon, the Committee took up the Augsburg Confession article by article in order. The discussion was now carried on principally by Dr. Eck and Philip Melanchthon. Spalatin has left us a report of what ensued. No objection was raised by the Catholics to the first article. Eck complained that in the second article Melanchthon had employed unusual words, but he said that in other respects the article was unobjectionable. There was perfect agreement in regard to the third article. The main contention that afternoon was over the fourth article, and particularly over the word *sola* in the formula, *faith alone justifies.* Eck said that that word could not be tolerated. Brentz replied that it could not be surrendered, for it had been employed by Ambrose and Hilary and was derived from Paul. Finally Eck said: You confess that forgiveness of sin takes place per gratiam gratum facientem, et fidem formaliter, et per verbum et sacramenta instrumentaliter. Mann soll den Artickel also stellen," that is, "the article is to be stated."*

Of articles V. VI. VII. VIII., Eck said: "In foundation and in substance we are not divided."

Spalatin reports: "No objection was made to the ninth article, of Baptism. The tenth article, *de Eucharistia*, of the venerable sacrament of the true body and blood of Christ, was

**Annales*, p. 159 *et seqq.* *Mueller*, *Historie*, p. 752. Cochleus reports in his *Philippicae Quatuor*, H. 1a: "The Lutherans of their own accord gave up and renounced this word *Sola*, and no longer said that we are justified by faith alone.—Therefore a brief statement of concord was then drawn up in the briefest possible form of words,—and unless my memory fails me, it was written by Philip himself—namely, that justification or remission of of sins takes place per gratiam gratum facientem et fidem formaliter, per verbum vero et sacramenta instrumentaliter," that is, "justification, the remission of sins, takes place by grace that makes a person righteous and by faith formally, but in fact by the Word and sacraments instrumentally." Quoted from Plitt's *Apologie der Augustana*, p. 49. Melanchthon, in his account of this colloquy, says: "He (Eck) wanted us to write: *Quod justificamur per gratiam et fidem.* I made no objection; but that fool doesn't know the meaning of the word *grace.*" C. R. II., 300. It is thus evident that for the nonce the *Lutheran* doctrine of justification by faith *alone* was surrendered. See Moeller's *Hist. of the Christ. Ch.* III., p. 112.

not found wanting, except that the word, *realiter* or *substantialiter*, or in the German, *wesentlich*, should be added."*

The next day, August 17th, the Committee was in session both in the forenoon and in the afternoon. As the result of deliberation the parties agreed in fifteen out of the first twenty-one Articles of the Confession. Three were held under dispute, and three were reserved to be considered in connection with Part II. On the 18th the Lutherans made an "explanation" (Erklärung) of the articles on which the Committee had agreed: †

ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT.

"In the first article there is agreement. When in the second Latin article it is said that man is by nature born without the fear of God and without faith in God, it is to be understood not only that young children cannot have this power (Wirkung), but that, weakened by nature, they are unable by natural powers to have the fear of God, and faith. And to be born without such power and gifts, is a want of righteousness which we are understood to derive from Adam.

"In the German this point is so clear that it was not attacked, namely, that we are not able by nature to fear God and to believe. Adults are also included.

"Of natural lusts we hold that the sin of nature remains, but the guilt is removed by Baptism.

"In the third article we are agreed.

"Of the fourth, fifth and sixth articles, we declare that remission of sins takes place through grace,‡ whereby we have a

*See Spalatin's *Report* in Spalatin's *Annales*, pp. 159 *et seqq.*, also in Förstemann II., pp. 223 *et seqq.* In the Apology, published the next year, Melanchthon added *et substantialiter* to the *vere*.

†Förstemann II., 230. Coehleus has left a report of the conclusions reached by the Committee on the sixteenth and seventeenth: "In the first session, after a friendly explanation of the words, they agreed on eleven articles, and sat until night. The next day they assembled in the forenoon and in the afternoon. Of the twenty-one articles of faith, they agreed in fifteen. Three remained in part the subject of controversy. The remaining three were remanded to the last part of the Confession." *Historia Martini Lutheri*, Hueber's German Translation, p. 406.

‡Chytraeus gives the Latin thus: *Quod Remissio peccatorum fiat per gratiam gratum facientem et per fidem in nobis*, p. 267.

gracious God, and that in us it takes place through faith, and by the word of God and the sacrament as by instruments.

"In the seventh article there is agreement.

"In the eighth article, Of the Church, we confess that in this life there are many wicked persons and sinners in the Church.

"In the ninth, tenth and eleventh articles, there is agreement.

"In the twelfth article, Of Sin, we do not deny that Repentance consists of three parts, viz.: Contrition, which is alarm, and leads to confession of sin. Confession. Yet here we should have proper regard to absolution, and should believe that sin is forgiven on account of the merit of Christ. The third part is satisfaction, the good fruit of repentance. Yet sin is not forgiven for the sake of satisfaction. Thus we hold alike. Yet we are not agreed as to whether satisfaction is necessary to the remission of punishment.

"In the thirteenth article there is agreement.

"In the fourteenth article there is agreement so far as pertains to words, But the declaration is treated under the title, Of Ecclesiastical Power.

"The fifteenth article is referred to the article, Of Episcopal Jurisdiction, and Monastic Vows.

"In the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth articles, there is agreement.

"In the twentieth article, so much as pertains to the preachers and the apology for them will be considered in its proper place, since we are not considering such things in this negotiation. But as regards faith we abide by the fourth article and the declaration in regard to it. In regard to good works we are agreed that we must and ought to do good works, and that works that proceed from faith and grace are well-pleasing to God. But whether these works are meritorious, or how they are meritorious, also whether or how we shall trust in them,—here there is no agreement. Hence it is deferred.

"In the twenty-first article we are agreed in two points, namely, that the saints and angels with God in heaven pray for us; and the custom of the Church which cherishes the memory of the saints and prays God to assist us by the prayers of the

Church, is Christian, and is to be held. But as regards the invocation of the saints, we are agreed in this, namely, that there exists no express command in the Scriptures which enjoins upon any one the invocation of the saints. But as to whether the saints, according to the received custom of the Universal Church, may be invoked with Christian intention,—on this there is a difference of opinion, since the Elector and Princes and other allies regard it as doubtful, and dangerous on account of the many abuses, and because there is no express Scripture for it."*

This is the first, and consequently, the oldest, "Explanation" of the Augsburg Confession, and was made by no less than seven persons who had been most active in its preparation, two of whom had signed it as containing the "doctrines" taught by their preachers in their dominions. It must be also borne in mind that the "Explanation" was such as satisfied the minds of the most pronounced and bigoted adherents of the papacy, as Duke George, Eck, Wimpina and Cochleus. Is such "the true, native, original and only sense" of the Augsburg Confession? and is such "explanation" to be accepted as in perfect accord with the teaching of the Holy Scriptures? These are questions that force themselves into the mind that candidly examines the official documents that record the history of that eventful period. Or was such an "explanation" wrung from the Committee in view of the terrible evils that impended? If so, then both the Confession and the Committee are placed in a most unfavorable light; for such an explanation would show that the Confession is capable of such and such an interpretation; that in its chief articles it *includes*, rather than *excludes*, the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, and that the Committee was deficient in those qualities of heroism for which some of them have been long and loudly praised. There is no escaping these conclu-

*Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, II., 230 *et seqq.*, taken from Spalatin's Manuscript, found in the Ansbach Archives. There is also a copy in the Weimar Archives. It is probable that Müller copied this into his *Historie*, pp. 745 *et seqq.* Varies in some places from Förstemann's copy. The Latin, in Coelestin, III., 55, 56, and in Chytraeus, pp. 267, 268.

sions from the "Explanation," which J. J. Müller calls "an essay from the Lutheran side showing the articles which are agreed upon—Aufsatz ex parte des Lutherischen Theils, in welchen Artickeln mann sich vereiniget."* Truth, however much it may run counter to our prejudices, our predilections and our sentiments, must have the right of way. The Saxon and the Brandenburg Ansbach (Margrave George) contingent had become alarmed, and were seeking to make peace on terms that must have proved not only humiliating to themselves, but disastrous to their cause. The compromise on Article IV. fully justifies Seckendorf's comment, that it contains the seeds of disputes.† There can be no doubt that had concord been established on this basis, the way would have been opened in the dominions of the Princes for the full restoration of the Roman Catholic doctrine of justification, as the same was subsequently set forth by the Council of Trent.

To many persons, doubtless, it will be a great surprise to learn that there was perfect agreement, in the Joint Committee, on Article X. The Evangelicals had allowed the Catholics to understand this article in their own way, or to read into it the Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. Hence it is impossible to vindicate them against the charge either of having dissimulated in the joint committee or of holding at that time, and of having purposely expressed, in the tenth article, a view of the sacrament that can be harmonized with the Roman teaching. That the latter alternative, rather than the former, must be accepted, is shown by several facts: Melanchthon had declared in his letter to Cardinal Campeggius, (See p. 371), that the Evangelicals "confess" the doctrine of concomitance, and he had used the very language of mediaeval Catholicism. In the Apology (*Prima Adumbratio*), presented, September 22nd, the Evangelicals say: "Of

**Historie*, p. 745. Spalatin reports as follows: "On Thursday after the Ascension of the Virgin ours reported to the Committee what we would maintain, what might be dropped and what not, mit geburlichem unerweisslichem erbieten." *Annales*, 169. This "Explanation" seems to have been the ultimatum of the Lutheran Committee.

†*Historia Lutheranismi*, II., p. 179.

the tenth. Neither do we imagine that the dead body of Christ is taken in the sacrament, nor the bloodless body, nor the blood without the body; but we believe that the whole living Christ is present in either part of the sacrament."* And that they did not mean to exclude, but rather to include, the doctrine of transubstantiation, is shown by the fact that in the first edition of the Apology, published in 1531, it is said: "We know that not only the Roman Church affirms the corporeal presence of Christ, but the Greek Church formerly believed and still believes the same. For this is proved by their Canon of the Mass, in which the Priest publicly prays that the bread having been changed, the very body of Christ may be formed. And Vulgarius, who appears to us to be no foolish writer, distinctly says that the bread is not only a figure, but is truly changed into flesh, sed vere in carnem mutari."†

*C. R. II., 285, 333. Compare the Papal Confutation, C. R. XXVII., 106. In the chief parts Melanchthon employs the language of the Confutation,—sub qualibet specie integrum Christum adesse. See Cochleus, L. II. *Artickeln*: "Under the forms of bread and wine, and under each of the same, the true body and the true blood of Christ our Saviour, are essentially and truly present." A. IV., 4.

†Prof. Kolde of Erlangen, than whom there is no higher authority on the Augsburg Confession, says: "The tenth article in its Latin form, not in the German which only reproduces Luther's form of expression ('in and under the bread and wine' Gr. Cat.) could be explained by the opponents in the sense of Transubstantiation, and not only did Melanchthon not refuse compliance with the demand of the Confutators to give this plainer expression, but in the interest of emphasizing unity with the Romanists in recognition of the reality, he has at least indirectly approved it by introducing passages from the Greek Church into the Apology." *Augsburg. Konfession*, p. 35. In a private letter to the writer Prof. Kolde says: "That in Art. X. Melanchthon, in order to make the antithesis to the Zwinglians and to the Oberlanders as sharp as possible, chose a form of statement, which (in the Latin Text) could be explained *transubstantianisch*, cannot be denied, as is evident from his position in the Apology." Prof. Jacoby says: "It cannot be denied that, at least in the German edition of the Augsburg Confession, and still more in the original edition of the Apology, Melanchthon has so stated the Lutheran doctrine, that the Catholics had to believe that in the dogma there was no difference between themselves and the Lutherans." *Liturgik der Reformatoren*, p. 90.

Long ago the learned Planck said: "This is indeed very certain, that the Catholics allowed the article to stand unchanged, because it did not attack their doctrine of Transubstantiation, and equally certain is it that

That there should have been agreement in regard to the Eleventh Article will also occasion surprise. Spalatin has recorded exactly the following: "Of Article XI., Of Confession, Dr. Eck says: In the chief thing (*Haubtsach*) it agrees with the Church. The sin which one does not know, one need not confess."*

When we consider that the canons of the Roman Catholic Church require every member of the Church to confess at least once a year, and that, to his or her own priest, we cannot but conclude that there was either a greak lack of frankness, or an enormous concession, on the part of the Evangelical members of the Committee. They knew what was meant in the Roman

Melanchthon purposely composed the article in these expressions so as not to touch this, nor to bring it under controversy." *Geschichte der Entstahung*, etc., III., Th. I., p. 112. In recent times Calinich has set forth the precise relation of the Tenth Article of the Augustana and the Apology to the Romish doctrine. *Zeitschrift fuer wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1870, 1871, 1873. See also Frank, *Die Theologie der Concordienformel*, III., 18 *et seqq.*, for remarkable concessions, to the effect that the difference is scarcely appreciable: "Had it been a chief point in the evangelical view to reject the transubstantiation of the Romish Church, the same would necessarily have had to come to the expression notwithstanding the irenic and conciliatory character of the Confession. But we do not find that stress was laid on antithesis to the Romish view. Much rather was the German form at least so constructed, that it would be possible to unite the doctrine of transubstantiation with it."

In the first Confutation it is said: "Here also the Princes in a praiseworthy manner agree with the Roman Catholic Church." Ficker *Die Erste Konfutation*, p. 40. In the Confutation of August 3rd the Catholic theologians say that the tenth article gives no offense in words, provided the Protestants hold to the doctrine of Concomitance. Jacobs's *Book of Concord*, II., 214. See above, p. 386. See also Fabricius's *Harmonia Confessionis Augustanae* (Roman Catholic), pp. 188–9, and Krauss's *Church History*, sub loco. Möller's *Hist. Chr. Ch.*, III., 107. Salig, I., 398–9. Kolde finds the lurking transubstantiation in the Latin Text. Jocoby, Frank and others find it in the German Text. The Romanist Confutators found it in both. See Andrew Fabricius, *Brill auff den Evangelischen Augapffel*, B. 11b. It is well known that in the second edition of the Apology (octavo, 1531) Melanchthon omitted the panem non tantum figuram esse, sed vere in carnem mutari. It was also omitted in Jonas's German translation of the Apology, made under Melanchthon's supervision.

**Annales*, 167

Church by *Confessio* and by *absolutio privata.* They were in no sense justified in allowing Eck and his part of the Committee to rest in the canonic and traditional sense of those words, unless they themselves meant that they should be so understood by themselves and by their party; and hence the Nurenberg Senate was fully justified in its sharp censure of the concession made in this article, since now the difference between the Romish and the Lutheran doctrine of Confession was so little that the common people could not distinguish the one from the other.*

REPORT OF THE CATHOLICS.

Much might be said about the agreement in articles XIII.,† XVIII., XX., but we pass them by in order to get room for the report of the Catholic part of the Committee: "The first part of the Confession embraces XXI. articles, in fifteen of which they (the Lutherans) agree with us throughout, but in the others in part. Three are to be referred to the abuses below, namely, the eleventh, fourteenth and fifteenth. Three differ in part, namely, the twelfth, twentieth and twenty-first.

"Concordant	1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 13. 16. 17. 18. 19.	Remissi infra sunt	11. 14. 15.	Ex parte discordant 12. 20. 21.

Of Article IV., this report says: "In discussing justifying

*Coelestin, III., 81b, Chytraeus, *Historia*, p. 299.

†The damnatory paragragh did not form any part of Art. XIII., as signed by the princes, and read before the Emperor. See Kolde *Augsb. Konf.*, p. 38. Ficker, p. 48.

faith we were unwilling to admit that we are justified by faith alone, because the apostle James does not admit it. Then it was agreed to say that we are justified by faith, but not by faith alone, because no Scripture has that, but rather the contrary. Therefore when the word *Sola* was omitted, it was agreed that justification or remission of sins takes place per gratiam gratum facientem et fidem formaliter through the word and the sacraments instrumentaliter."

Of the Tenth Article the report says: "They agree that the body and blood of the Lord are truly present, and for better explanation vere et realiter, German, wesentlich, was added."

Of the Thirteenth Article it is said: "They agree that the sacraments were instituted not only that they might be marks of profession among men, but rather that they might be signs and testimonies of the will of God toward us."*

It will be seen that the Lutherans are represented as agreeing with the papists.† It is certain that the agreement in the Fourth Article rests on a papal formula. That is, the Lutheran Seven virtually surrendered the article which more than any other is distinctive of Protestantism, the article of a standing or falling Church. Indeed had a union been formed on the basis of the report of either half of this joint committee, Protestantism would have been ruined, and Rome would have regained her sway over the entire Church. But the painful part of the reflection is that the approximation was mainly from the side of the Protestants, who, as we shall hereafter learn, had almost completely lost their courage, and were willing,—that is, the Saxons and the Margravians,—to purchase peace at almost any price. Happily there was an influence, partly from without and partly from within—the Nurenbergers, Lüneburgers, the Hessians and *Luther*—which greatly helped to save the day.

THE SECOND PART OF THE CONFESSION.

Having agreed substantially on the First Part of the Confes-

*Coelestin, III., 43 *et seqq*. Chytraeus, *Historia*, p. 239 *et seqq*.

†There is another report in the Latin language given by Förstemann in his *Urkundenbuch*, Vol II., pp. 233 *et seqq*.

sion, the joint committee took up the Second Part on the 18th of August.* The Catholics preferred to begin with the last article, fearing lest a report should reach the people about both species. But when the Lutherans objected, the Catholics began the preparation of terms (Moderamen) in writing, protesting, however, that "they would not decide nor conclude anything, but would refer everything to the Estates and to the Emperor."

They begin with Article XXII. of the Confession, and, "concede to the Lutherans both species under about the following conditions:

"I. That their pastors administer both species to their own parishioners only, and only in those places where such custom has prevailed for some years already.

"II. That it be preceded by private confession, according to ancient custom.

"III. That at Easter and whenever this sacrament be administered, they teach the people that God has not commanded to receive both species.

"IV. That they teach that the whole Christ is present and is received under one species, not less than under both.

"V. That they teach that those do not sin who commune under only one species.

"VI. That when their subjects desire only one species, they shall give or cause it to be given to them.

"VII. That they shall not reserve the species of wine, not carry it to the sick through the streets, but in the church or at home during the celebration of Masses administer both species to those who desire them."

The next day the Protestant committee made response as follows: "They are willing that the Sacrament be received preceded by confession. They wish the pastors and preachers to speak pacifically about these things until a future decision in a Council. Likewise they confess that the entire body of Christ is under the species of bread. They deny that they have up to

*Schirrmacher, 222; Spalatin, *Annales*, 169; Coelestin, III., 44. Chytraeus, *Historia*, 244. These authorities do not agree perfectly regarding the date.

this time prohibited any one from taking the Sacrament under one species, where he was able to have it. They deny that among them the species of wine has been reserved in vessels or has been carried to the sick. In a word they wish that the venerable Sacrament be held in honor among them as heretofore.

"When the Catholics sought to have certain ambiguous words explained, after considering the matter for some time, August 21st the Lutherans replied that every person intending to commune should previously make Confession on the more important points by which his conscience was burdened, in order to seek counsel and consolation on these things.

"Secondly, they declare that they believe that the whole Christ, his body and blood, true God and man, is truly under either species, or under the alternate species sub utraque specie, aut etiam sub utralibet, aut altera vere esse.

"Thirdly, they declare during the discussion that they do not condemn those who formerly took or now take only one species. Neither do they believe that those do wrong who receive one species. Nevertheless they are not willing to have this preached to theirs. Also the deliberation between the Seven and Seven was only in regard to both species. Hence it is evident that there was not much difference between the parties on this subject. For in these things they differ from us only in that while they and we believe that those do not sin who receive one species, they (the Lutherans) do not want this to be preached to theirs, though they confess that the whole Christ is truly under one species. Nevertheless they contend that the command of Christ, given alike to ministers and to laymen, is to take both, because he said: 'Drink ye all of it'. But ours respond from Mark: And they all drank of it, so that it is understood that it was said to the twelve disciples who supped with him. Hence but for obstinacy there would easily have been agreement on this subject."*

In their *Moderamen* the Catholic Seven show cunning, and

*Schirrmacher, pp. 229 *et seqq*,; Coelestin III., 44; Chytraeus, *Historia*, pp. 244 *et seqq*.

make some concessions. The Response of the Lutheran Seven shows ambiguity, and makes larger concessions. Concomitance is admitted in amplest terms, and private confession of the more important sins is approved, and is made a prerequisite to communion. As a consequence "there was not much difference between the parties on this subject,"* that is, in regard to the article *de utraque specie Sacramenti* (Art. XXII).

FINAL REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEES.

The other articles of the Second Part of the Confession were taken up in order and discussed. The propositions of the Catholic Seven, and the responses of the Lutheran Seven, are reported by Spalatin, and are given in Latin in Schirrmacher, Coelestin and Chytraeus, and in German in J. J. Müller's *Historie*, but they are too long to be transferred in full to these pages. We must content ourselves with a synopsis.

1. In regard to the marriage of Priests, it was demanded that it be tolerated only where the custom had existed for some time already; that there be no new marriages; that priests should be allowed to return to celibacy; that so soon as could be done, celibate priests be put into the places of married ones; that married priests be ejected from office, unless a dispensation could be obtained from the Pope or his legate.

The Protestants reply by referring to their Confession, where they give reasons for the marriage of the Clergy. "On this subject there was no further discussion between the Seven and the Seven, because there was greater difference here than in regard to both species." It was left to be referred to the Estates of the Empire and to the Emperor.

2. The Catholics demanded that both public and private Mass be celebrated on the altar at the usual festivals, and that both canons of the Mass be used. The Protestants reply that the Mass is celebrated with the usual ceremonies according to the institution of Christ. They persist in rejecting the Canon.

*Coelestin, III., 44b.

But the record says: "There is not much difference on this article."

3. In regard to Confession the Catholics propose nothing in writing, because the matter had already been treated in Article XII. The Protestants add three things: First, that Confession ought not to be omitted, on account of the great comfort in absolution. Secondly, that it may be known how grand and salutary is the power of the Keys. Thirdly, that the people may be accustomed to confess their sins; also that those sins are remitted which are not enumerated. On these subjects there was no need of further discussion between the parties.

4. Under Article XXVI. they proposed the restoration of fasts, festivals, confessions, prayers, processions, ceremonies and distinctions of meats and times, as they had been observed by the Catholic Church from antiquity. The Protestants respond that for the sake of Charity, and for the peace and unity of the Church, general ceremonies may be observed, but that they are not to be regarded as necessary to the worship of God. They consent that for the hearing of the word of God, and for the administration of the sacraments, the following days are to be observed: All Sundays, Christmas, St. Stephen's, St. John the Evangelist's, the Lord's Circumcision, Epiphany, holy week for celebrating the Passion of Christ, Easter with two or three holidays, Ascension Day, Pentecost with two or three holidays, the Principal Festivals of the Virgin, the Feasts of all the Apostles.

5. The Catholics require the complete restoration of the monastic institution. The Protestants wish to hold the matter of monastic vows free to the conscience of every one until the decision of a council can be obtained, to protect former monks and nuns from violence, and to have the property of dissolved monasteries used for the support of schools and parishes until a council could meet.

6. As touching ecclesiastical power the Catholics seek the full restoration of the Episcopal power and government, minus the abuses. The Protestants consent to such restoration of power and jurisdiction, but will not justify the abuses on the

part of the Bishops, their neglect of preaching and of the administration of the sacraments.

"All these things were publicly reported, August 22nd, to the Electors, Princes and Estates of the Holy Roman Empire, by the Catholic members of the Committee," that is, what we have condensed under the six foregoing heads, is a synopsis of the Report of the Catholics.*

Coelestin says that the Catholic report is inaccurate, and hence that the Protestants found it necessary to order Melanchthon to make corrections. The corrections made by Melanchthon in regard to this Second Part of the Confession are confined to Confession, Communion under both species, Celibacy of the Clergy and Private Masses. They are, in synopsis, as follows: In Confession an enumeration of sins is not necessary; Communion under one kind is excused on account of necessity; where God has not bestowed the gift of Chastity, marriage is the remedy; Private Masses and the Canon are rejected for very grave reasons.

Melanchthon's corrections do change the purview, though they still leave much to be desired; and, as we shall learn hereafter, the concessions made gave grave offence to many in the Protestant party. But as the corrections were too long to be read before the Emperor, they were reduced to two articles, *De utraque specie Sacramenti Altaris, et Conjugio Sacerdotali.*

As these were presented as a kind of Protestant ultimatum, they should appear here in full:

"1. The institution and clear text of the Evangelists is: Drink ye all of it.

"2. Thus was it observed in the entire Church formerly by the holy fathers and bishops for more than a thousand years.

"3. It is not known when, and by whom the species of the wine was abolished—not indeed in the Canons.

"4. The Emperor should consider that a divine command is not removed by the reasons produced and the writings inappropriately cited by the adversaries.

*Coelestin, III., 45 *et seqq.*

"5. We cannot consent that the species of the wine should be prohibited.

"6. Nothing in the divine appointments is to be rashly changed, nor are we to consent to changes.

"7. Much less can we approve and praise it when the adverversaries say it is an abuse for the laity to receive both species. For an institution of Christ cannot be called an abuse.

"8. In regard to these things Christ has threathened, Matt. 5, that whosoever shall break one of the least of the commandments shall be least."

"De Conjugio Sacerdotali."

"1. This subject does not call for a long discusssion; for it is clear.

"2. The contrary is an impious opinion, because it is a doctrine of demons.

"3. It is contrary to the command of God.

"4. It is contrary to the creation of God.

"5. It is contrary to the order of God.

"6. It is an impossible vow.

"7. But a vow cannot take away the command, creation and order of God.

"8. Only let the Emperor consider how great is the scandal everywhere.

"9. The adversaries do well in lauding chastity, but why do they not practice that which they praise? Also there is chastity in marriage, as Paphnutius says.

"10. Inasmuch as they declare that chastity is possible, why do they not also exhibit it? The lives of the celibate priests are known

"11. Even though chastity were possible, nevertheless marriage is not to be prohibited by law. For it lays a snare for consciences, and is a doctrine of demons, and has given power to the Pope to load the priests with this burden.

"12. Ambrose has said: Chastity can only be recommended; it cannot be enjoined. It is a matter of wish, rather than command.

"13. Moreover, it is a divine command: Let each one have his own wife. Let a bishop be the husband of one wife. Not all can receive this word: It is not good for a man to be alone. But a divine command cannot be removed by a human prohibition, for the obligation of the contracting parties is a matter of the divine law.

"14. They that prohibit marriage, become guilty, and partakers of all the shames and fornications.

"15. They also become participants and guilty of the shedding of the blood of all who are killed on this account.

"16. It would also be a great cruelty to deprive the Church of priests by prohibiting or separating them from pious wives. For where could we now get suitable celibates for all the parishes?

"17. For many centuries in the primitive Church, even upon the confession of the adversaries, sacerdotal and episcopal marriage was practiced.

"18. Even to-day in the Eastern Church there are married priests."*

The Joint Committee of Fourteen finished its work, August 22nd.† The same day the Protestant part of the Committee made a verbal report at the lodging of the Elector of Saxony.‡ The Catholic part reported to the Catholic estates at the *Rathhaus.*§ Seckendorf says justly that neither party expressed itself with sufficient accuracy and perspicuity. Each party concealed rather than revealed its true sentiment, and each party accused the other of a lack of candor. Yet there were still some unreduced differences, but the "concessions" made by the Protestants "included a restoration of the externals of the Church to an extent no longer to be expected,"|| and consequently awoke strong opposition from within their own ranks.¶ But with these reports and statements the negotiations of the Joint Committee

*Coelestin, III., 48, 49.

†Coelestin, III., 49b. ‡C. R., II., 300, 301.

§Schirrmacher, 524; Coehleus, *Historia*, p. 406.

||Ranke, *Hist. of the Reformation*, Eng. Trans. p. 366. "Most far-reaching concessions," says Moeller, *Hist. of the Christ. Ch.* III., 112.

¶Schirrmacher, p. 242–3.

terminated. Doctrine, as Plitt observes,* had been wholly cast aside, and the discussions had been narrowed down to "two articles, about which there was the chief contention, namely, the sacrament and the marriage of the priests."† But on these points neither party would yield to the other, even though it was understood that no agreement in committee was to be final, but that the points at issue were to be referred to a general council. Thus the Committee of Fourteen failed to agree on a basis of union.

The learned and judicious Rotermund has closed his account of the negotiations of the Committee of Fourteen with the following observations: "Both formerly and in recent times the two parties engaged in efforts to restore harmony, have been bitterly reproached. The Roman Catholics have been accused of cunningly and deceitfully circumventing the Evangelicals by trying to make the impression of a reformation in doctrine in order to lead them again under the domination of the Church. It must indeed be conceded that they used cunning artifices for the purpose of recovering their opponents from so wide an estrangement. But it could not certainly have been their purpose to deceive them. Melanchthon and the two other theologians of his party must have been extraordinarily short-sighted, not to have observed in the beginning of the colloquium that the Roman Catholics were not willing to change anything in the essentials of their faith and church polity. Never did the hope of peace between the Protestants and the Roman Church seem so near its realization as in the negotiations of the two commit-

**Apologie der Augustana*, p. 52. After presenting a brief summary of the concession made by the Saxon theologians, August 18th (Förstermann, II., p. 244), Plitt goes on to say: "Thus the Saxon theologians. The next day, August 19, the Evangelical members of the Committee of Fourteen make their declaration in accordance with this *Gutachten*: If Communion under both kinds, the marriage of their clergy, and their order of the Mass, he allowed them until matters can be further discussed in a free General Council, they are ready in other things for agreement (zur Vergleichung bereit), and will order their ministers to render due obedience to the bishops, and will not oppose their proper jurisdiction." *Apologie der Augustana*, p. 51.

†Coelestin, III., 48 b.

tees from the 16th to the 20th of August, and never would a peace have brought with it such pernicious consequences for the Protestants, as this one, had it been effected. If the ruling of a higher power be not recognized here, then it remains inexplicable, that a better use was not made of the yielding temper (Nachgiebigkeit) of the Protestants. Both parties were agreed on the first ten, the thirteen, the sixteenth to the nineteenth, articles of the Confession. Fortunately the negotiations with reference to the Lord's Supper came to naught."*

[TO BE CONCLUDED.]

ARTICLE V.

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.†

By. PRES. C. W. HEISLER, D. D.

Mr. President, Fathers and Brethren of the Board of Directors, Ladies and Gentlemen :

In formally assuming the duties of the office of President of Susquehanna University, to which you have, with such kindly unanimity, elected me, it is but proper that I should give some expression to my conception of Higher Education in these times, and of the policy which it shall be my earnest endeavor to pursue.

I desire to address you upon HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY. I am persuaded that I could scarcely announce a more important and timely topic for presentation on this occasion. I can but barely touch upon the many points involved.

The present age is so varied in its character, so phenomenal in its general results, that no one characterization of it would be just or adequate. The Socialist will claim that this is the great sociological age. The Political Economist will insist that it

**Geschichte des auf dem Reichstage zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530 uebergegeben Glaubensbekentnisses der Protestanten*, p. 131.

†Inaugural Address.

bears a distinctively economic cast. The Diplomatist will likely argue that this is the great world age, because of great international questions arising, and the international reconstructions going on. The Biblical student will point with pride to the marvelous activity in the spheres of criticism and interpretation, and claim that it may be justly characterized as the age of Biblical Criticism. The devout Christian worker will discourse glowingly upon this as the great missionary age of the Church, while the educator assumes a special right to characterize it as an Educational Age.

They are all correct. For these marvelous times of ours mean all this.

A very cursory review of the Educational history of this country during the last 100 years will convince anyone of the phenomenal advance in Educational facilities and conditions. The memory of men yet with us easily runs back to the time when the public school was a luxury for the few for three or four months of the year.

At the beginning of this century we had 3 Theological Seminaries; 3 Medical Schools; 3 Law Schools. In 1899 we had 472 Colleges and Universities, 1800 Professors, 158,000 students, representing an investment of about a half billion dollars. We have 165 Theological Seminaries with 1070 Professors, and 8,093 students; 156 Medical Schools, with 5,735 Professors, and 24,-119 students. We have 87 Law Schools, with 970 Professors, and 11,883 students. It is estimated that one person in every 470 in the U. S. is attending college, a larger proportion than ever before. Interest in Higher Education in this country has remarkably increased in recent years. Institutions have been multiplying. Men of wealth have been contributing princely sums for buildings and endowment. According to the *Chicago Tribune*, during 1899, $79,749,956.00 were given to Educational and Charitable institutions. Of this vast sum, Mrs. Leland Stanford gave $28,000,000 to Stanford University, and Mrs. Phoebe Hearst $10,000,000 to the University of California, while John D. Rockafeller contributed another $2,000,000 to the University of Chicago. Howard got $1,544,000 and

Rochester Theological Seminary $150,000. The University of Chicago is but a few years old, and yet to-day its assets amount to $11,000,000. We do not pause to discuss the wisdom displayed in the concentration and expenditure of these vast sums. One cannot help questioning, at times, the wisdom of such phenomenal extravagance in the erection of university buildings. One thing may be noted that this has a tendency, in very many instances to make higher education increasingly expensive. In some of them, at least, higher education is now practically confined to the sons of wealthy parents. We shall not pause, I say, to discuss this aspect of the question, but merely call attention to these royal gifts to emphasize the New Era in Education which has recently downed in our country.

Now what as to the character of the higher education in this wonderful new century upon which we are entering? The speaker is slightly embarrassed in the treatment of his subject from the fact that we have here a theological school in connection with an undergraduate school, and they should be treated separately.

It may seem almost gratuitous to insist that higher education in the twentieth century must be thorough at the same time that it is comprehensive. The teacher of to-day is almost bewildered by the newer educational methods. The ways of the fathers will not suffice for their aggressive and progressive sons. And this is well *per se*. But sometimes I fear that some of the advance of the present day is at the expense of thoroughness. Cramming and crowding seem, only too often, to be the watchwords in the primary schools, and this process is carried into higher education. The Chicago High School, several years ago comprehended 65 branches of study. When a little girl of eleven in the third or fourth grade is burdened with nine studies, the crowding process is painfully apparent. It is quite within the truth to assert that this method too largely obtains in the college and university courses.

The realm of learning has been enlarging at an enormous rate. Whole zones of knowledge are opening up constantly.

The horizon of mental vision has immensely widened in recent years. A well educated man of fifty years ago would have much to unlearn and vastly more to learn to-day. During the middle ages, theology and dialectics held the day. With Bacon was ushered in a new principle of investigation, and soon was opened up a new world of knowledge. With all the startling discoveries of the then recent past, the scientist, at the opening of this century stood simply on the threshold of modern scientific research and discovery. Almost every blow of the geologist's hammer, almost every experiment in the chemical and biological laboratory has opened up new vistas of human knowledge to the diligent and enthusiastic investigator. What is true of natural science may also be predicated of philosophy, sociology, and theological science. Higher and lower criticism have given marvelous impulse to Biblical study. Monastery and monument, buried cities and ancient ruins, have yielded up richest treasures, and opened new fields to the Biblical student. All these things mean expansion, enlargement in the college curriculum. To cover, even partially, the field of human knowledge is a far different task from what it used to be. The modern college simply must keep pace with this advancing line of education. It must be comprehensive. But in this it dare not lose its old thoroughness.

It is time, we believe, to call a halt. The training of our higher schools must be comprehensive, and must make educated men in the modern sense of the term. But whilst broadening out we must not flatten out into distressing thinness. While we offer more, what is given must be thoroughly given. By some means we must see to it that, while our educational systems take account of all the contributions of the recent past, we do not fail to educate in the truest and highest sense. If our sons are to get more than their fathers got in college, we must insist that they shall get this just as thoroughly as their fathers received their portion. Boards of directors and faculties must set their faces like a flint against shallowness and superficiality.

Thus let us remark that the higher education of the twentieth century must be conservative and progressive. To some

extent there is war in the elements as to what should constitute a modern college education. This has been brought out conspicuously by the *Cosmopolitan.* The editor of this magazine, four years ago, contended "that there was no commission of disinterested men whose duty it was to inquire broadly into the relative importance of the various branches of education. It was made clear that, on the contrary, the organization of the average university was such that every obstacle was thrown in the way of disinterested consideration of these questions. The professors of Latin and Greek occupied prominent and influential positions at the faculty meetings; they exerted the strongest pressure in favor of the maintenance of those standards of education which were in vogue more than two centuries ago." The general trend of these charges was that the present system of college education is antiquated and unsuited to the conditions of modern life. A number of university presidents were invited to discuss the question: "Does modern college education educate in the broadest and most liberal sense of the term?" and answer, if possible, the charge of the *Cosmopolitan.* The papers of these presidents did not suit the editor of the *Cosmopolitan.* His charges represent, in an exaggerated form, questions that have arisen in many minds during recent years. The fact is we live in such a utilitarian age that many people carry the spirit of commercialism into our educational processes and methods. Of every proposed subject or course of study the irrepressible inquiry starts—"*cui bono?*" Dr. Arthur T. Hadley, the new President of Yale, gives a very lucid account of the two general phases of higher educational processes obtaining at the present day, the conservative or classical, and the progressive or modern. The first school "believe that a liberal education consists very largely in the study of ancient literature and the languages in which that literature was composed. Next in relative import, in such a scheme of education come deductive sciences, mathematics, logic, and the older form of psychology. Modern languages and especially science, while not wholly excluded are given a subordinate and incidental place in such a course." The advocate of the modern system "lays

stress on the study of modern science, in all its varied branches. With deductive theories, except pure mathematics he wishes to have as little to do as possible." He begrudges the time spent on ancient languages, and lays relatively more stress on modern languages. "He insists above all things on the necessity of a thorough study of one's own languge and its literature, as being a more important element in general education, than the literature of any classical nation is likely to furnish."

It will be noticed that the ordinary classical and scientific college courses are formed in accordance with these two system as so stated.

At first we might think this was simply a matter of the kind of studies to be pursued, and of their relative utility in training for practical life. But the question is a deeper one than that. It has to do with power and culture. The conservative claims that the old systems in which memory plays so important a part and in which individual, personal, hard work is so strongly insisted upon issues in better mental discipline, in a broader intellectual range, in firmer mental grasp, in short, in larger psychic power. The modern pleads for more freedom, for less of the trammel of the old tread-mill system, and more liberty on the part of the student in the selection of his studies with more distinct adaptation to his life work. It would estimate carefully the *cui bono* of each particular study pursued. Some one has pithily characterized the modern system as that of the three "Ls"; the Lecture, pouring into the student a mass of facts and principles: then sending him into the Library to investigate for himself and construct his own hypothesis; and then into the Laboratory for experimentation and verification. This is very taking, and to my mind is almost the ideal method for the post-graduate, but for the under-graduate it is easily liable to great abuse, so far as the truest and highest results of an education are concerned. The conservative pleads for general training as a basis for professional or special training. The modern insists that the special or professional shall reach down into the under-graduate course, and largely determine that; in other words, that the whole intellectual training, shall be, in a sense, special.

These are practically the two great systems. On this whole subject we may be permitted to say briefly:

First, that it seems to us that a proper balance between these two systems can and ought to be struck. Both have points of great excellence. A golden mean is possible. Let us hold fast to what is best in the old or conservative system, at the same time adopting readily what is most excellent in the modern. Reformers at first are always apt to be extreme. An equilibrium can be struck. And educators are certainly coming closer together on these two phases of educational process.

Secondly. At the same time we strongly feel that we cannot give up too much of the old well-tried system. That system stands for a general mental training and power as a basis for special and professional training. We are still old fashioned enough to hold that memory culture, the power of attention, as well as observation, the power of nice discrimination as well as generalization, skill in deduction as well as keenness in induction, ability to think steadily and profoundly as well as brilliancy in discovery and investigation, and a broad and general culture as well as special training for special life work, are the true end and aim of higher education. Now it seems to be admitted that the old system develops culture and power, whilst the modern develops power more especially but very little culture. Dr. Charles F. Thwing writes: "It is a notorious fact that to modern scientific school, called by various names, such as technical, polytechinal, or technological, does not train gentlemen of culture. It makes good engineers, chemists, or electricians. It does not make men of learning. The college does not make engineers, or chemists or electricians, but it does endeavor to make men of liberal learning."

Any one acquainted with instruction in professional schools knows full well that the well-trained mind has here an immense advantage over the poorly or superficially disciplined, in his grasp of these special studies and his general ability to master them. To yield to the demand of the extreme modern must mean to narrow intellectual training, and issue in a deficiency of general culture. On the other hand we need not yield to the

demand of the extreme conversation and make of the ancient languages a fetish, as Charles Francis Adams puts it. On the whole the moderate conservative will produce a larger general culture and mental discipline; while the moderate reformer will secure more brightness, life, elasticity, adaptiveness to our educational system.

Thirdly. All this has a bearing upon the subject of required and elective studies in the college curriculum. For ourselves we do not favor electives at all in the lower classes. With possibly the last term of Sophomore year may begin, in either the classical or scientific course, a system of electives or optional studies, along with certain required branches. The educational world for a time ran wild on electives. The whole curriculum was practically elective. We are getting back to a state of proper equilibrium on this subject. We cannot resist the conviction that educators of years of experience can arrange a more satisfactory and profitable course of study than a young man in his teens. The system of electives may be most advantageously used along with required courses, that will preserve the integrity of the college curriculum.

Fourthly. One thing more along this line of progressiveness and conservatism in our higher education for this new century. If the college course is worth anything along the lines indicated it must preserve its integrity. But see what stress is brought to bear to shorten it and mar its integrity. Some of the professional schools, especially law and medical, are increasing their courses to four years. This means that many young men must accordingly abbreviate the college course. The tendency is to omit the Senior year and shorten the course to three years. And yet the Senior year ought to be the most fruitful in the matter of general culture, in a symmetrical rounding out of the educational process, and in introducing the student into the wider realms of knowledge. Now to accommodate the student who desires to abbreviate his course, the effort is made to cover the first year of medicine and law in the Senior year in college. But according to recent medical catalogues, to enter the Sophomore class of the medical college the student must take in his

Senior year at least 450 hours of medical science, and during the rest of his course 504 hours additional. That simply means that his Senior year is devoted to medical study, and the integrity of the Senior college year is entirely destroyed. The question at once arises whether the student under such circumstances is entitled to his A. B. or B. S. degree. Then the law schools will make similar demands. The theological schools have the right to ask the same. And then what becomes of the college course? In addition to this, preparatory and high schools are striving to cover the college Freshman year. This would practically shorten a college course to two years? Are we ready for that? Certainly not. We must stand for proper conservatism along with true progress.

It is but a step a little further along in the same line to say that the higher education of the twentieth century must be thoroughly up to date. It must be fully adapted to the new industrial, sociological, civic conditions. We are in the very heart of a great transitional period. Recent years have marked an industrial revolution. So striking has this been as almost to justify ex-Senator Ingall's remark that "modern agriculture has come to be a sedentary occupation." The multiplication of labor saving devises, the discoveries and achievements of modern science, the phenomenal increase of transportation and intercommunication facilities, have brought in an almost entirely new life. A somewhat different order of men is being developed. A new era has dawned. The man of to-day must be not so much a man of muscle to work as a man of brain to run a machine and direct work. A recent writer finely says: "Muscular development and physical development, are no longer interchangeable terms. Mere muscular development no longer adds particularly to a man's privilege and efficiency. Samson could not now be a hero by virtue of mere physical strength. * * * Of what use would Hercules be in these times? We kill our Nemean lions with bullets. * * * What is needed now in physical development is not the arm of a Sullivan, but the hand of a Rubenstein. Man is becoming less a direct physical worker himself, and more a manager of work. Almost all work

is done by machinery and tools. The lever is the sceptre of the age." Conditions have greatly changed. The trolley and telephone and boards of health and industrial establishments are revolutionizing social conditions. The new patriotism, the wider world view and relations are affecting political and civic life very materially. The study of civics, Parkhurst movements, Lexow investigations, the defeat of political bosses, are creating a new citizenship. The breaking up of antiquated nationalities, the partitioning of ancient territories, the opening of Congo Valleys, the noble labors of the missionary, the greed of the speculator, the ambitions of the diplomatist, are constantly raising new international questions. America is stepping abroad into the sphere of world politics and commerce as never before. In Philadelphia is an institution where an army of clerks have on exhibition classified specimens of the products of every clime on the earth and a list of all the commercial and industrial establishments of any note in the world, with full information as to conditions, needs, opportunities, possibilities. This is for the benefit of Philadelphia's business men. Think what this means.

Now we simply contend that our higher education of the twentieth century must take account of all these new and enlarged conditions. Accordingly some reconstruction of the old curricula is absolutely necessary. Along these lines, to some extent, the conservative must make concessions to the educational reformer. But after all, the reconstructions must apply to the later rather than to the earlier periods of the college course, and must lie largely in the domain of the electives. To meet these new conditions, entrance requirements have been raised again and again, it must be still more. Our higher education must be thoroughly up to date. The young people of to-day must be prepared for the larger world life into which they are stepping, and the college course must be so adapted on conservative lines as to secure this.

And now a word as to the course of instruction in our theological seminaries. Instruction here must meet the new de-

mands of the new era. The pioneer age of church work in this country is about passed. The time was when our church work was so marvelously expanding that incomplete preparation for the gospel ministry seemed in many cases justifiable. A short cut to the ministry was openly advocated. But the necessity for this has largely passed away. The age demands more and more a highly educated ministry. This practically goes without saying. There never was a time when the preacher must be so many-sided in his capabilities and acquisitions or meet so many and diversified demands as at present. The Church for her own self-preservation must more and more insist on a highly educated ministry. This all will concede. But this does not state the whole of the case. The course of theological instruction needs some reconstruction. This process has been in operation, but it has not yet gone far enough.

To start with, the theological seminaries ought strenuously to insist upon higher entrance requirements. They dare not in this lag behind other professional schools. Law and medical schools are rapidly moving to the demand of a B. S. or B. A. degree for entrance. Dare our theological schools do less? I am persuaded that only in very exceptional cases ought they to admit students who have not pursued a regular college course. The age demands this. The Church demands it.

Then the course itself needs fuller adjustment to existing conditions. For example, our theological courses need revision in the matter of systematic study of the English Bible, as a book and as a tool for the worker. It is lamentably true that many and many a theological graduate who reads his Hebrew and Greek rather glibly, scarcely knows his English Bible. Put him before a class for normal Bible study, or beside a sinner seeking the way of life, or a poor soul under the clouds of sorrow or nearing death, and his Bible is almost an unknown book. This ought not to be. It must not be.

Then, again, I am persuaded that sociological study must occupy a larger place in our theological schools. The origin, growth, functions; the anatomy, physiology, hygiene, of human

society deserve the largest and most systematic study on the part of the public teacher. We, as preachers, lose immensely if we neglect this important science. The preacher is becoming more and more a public man. His work is coming to touch more and more all phases of our complex social life. He is bound to touch public questions, as a minister of the Great Socialist of the ages, the Lord Jesus Christ. I regard this as of prime importance.

Then, again, the theological course is susceptible of improvement in the matter of the study of Christian Ethics, and, as perhaps involved in this, the study of the spirit of the age. We need not descend to the old Casuistical Ethics. But certain it is that this age is bringing into new light certain great ethical questions. The sociological, the economic, the theological, the international spirit of the age are bringing up ever new ethical relations and problems. The foundations must be re-examined. New applications of old principles must be made. The minister must preach the fundamental principles of Christian ethics, to go out to the largest usefulness in the great world of the twentieth century.

Then, again, the theological course is susceptible of some reconstruction along the lines of homiletical instruction. It is a little difficult, in so brief a space, to make clear what I mean by this. But it is something like this: The peculiar spirit of these times demands a different style of preaching from that obtaining in the old times of our forefathers. The preacher of the twentieth century will have a different audience from that of the middle of the nineteenth. It is an audience of keener intellectual power, of a higher grade of general intelligence, of more breadth of information, affected with more of the utilitarian and commercial spirit; an audience of more sensitive nerves, and more sensuous emotions, a more restless, imperious, exacting audience, along certain lines. It is not a more thoughtful audience than of old, nor one that will so readily grapple with abstruse theological questions, rather the reverse. This audience requires the same old gospel of the crucified Christ, but it demands it set forth in a different form and spirit. The truth

must be made more vivid, presented in a more striking form, with more grace in its delivery; it must be applied to new social conditions. The homiletical teachers of the twentieth century must turn out preachers who can carry the old gospel of Christ to the people in such a manner that they will hear.

Moreover, I think the time has come when our theological schools should more generally offer a system of electives. Some provisions ought to be made for specialization along theological lines. This is already done in some theological schools. It ought to be more generally done.

I had desired to point out, also, that the higher education of the twentieth contury must take account of the specializing tendency of the age in its undergraduate courses, but I must move on to the last point.

This higher education must be thoroughly and positively Christian. This may seem like hackneyed phrasing. But no matter. It stands for a stupendously important fact. Further study upon this subject but renders my convictions the more profound. I am unalterably opposed to any system of intellectual education divorced from the moral or religious. I can do no better than to quote the earnest words of Prof. Woodrow Wilson at Princeton's Jubilee several years ago, as reported in *The Independent:*

"Turning to the scientific spirit, Professor Wilson found it breeding contempt for the wisdom of the past and full of the arrogance of individualism.

'"Its laboratories are brisk with the spirit of discovery; its lecture rooms resound with the discussion of new theories of life and novel programs of reform. There is no radical like your learned radical, bred in the schools; and thoughts of revolution have in our time been harbored in universities as naturally as they were once nourished among the encyclopedists. It is the scientific spirit of the age that has wrought the change. * * * I am much mistaken if the scientific spirit of the age is not doing us a great disservice, working in us a certain great degeneracy. Science has bred in us a spirit of experiment and a contempt for the past. It has made us credulous of quick

improvement, hopeful of discovering panaceas, confident of success in every new thing. * * * I should tremble to see social reform led by men who had breathed [this atmosphere]; I should fear nothing better than utter destruction from a revolution conceived and led in the scientific spirit.

' "Do you wonder, then," he cries, "that I ask for the old drill, the old memory of times gone by, the old schooling in precedent and tradition, the old keeping of faith with the past, as a preparation for leadership in days of social change? We have not given science too big a place in our education; but we have made a perilous mistake in giving it too great a preponderance in method over every other branch of study. We must make the humanities human again; we must recall what manner of men we are; we must turn back once more to the region of practical ideals. * * * The air of affairs should be admitted into the class rooms, * * * the air of the world's transactions, the consciousness of the solidarity of the race; the sense of the duty of man toward man, of the presence of man in every problem, of the significance of truth for guidance as well as for knowledge." '

These are noble words. Religion has nothing to fear from science or philosophy. "The foundation of the Lord standeth sure." The truth is mighty and will prevail. The word of God liveth and abideth forever. The throne of Jehovah is founded deep down in the eternities, and it is worse than utter nonsense to tremble as to the stability of that throne, as to the final outcome between truth and error. "Our God's in his heaven and all's well in this world." But there is danger that the individual soul may be moved from its moorings and drift away into the sea of scepticism. There is a real danger in the respect of a boy or girl in the formative period of life, when the seductive ideas of rationalism are presented with all the charm of novelty and of literary grace that their minds will be poisoned and they will stray from the old paths. The influence of the teacher is paramount. And so we must insist on Christian teachers for our boys and girls and Christian influences and environments for them, and positive Christian instruction in their undergrad-

uate courses of study. As a teacher of some of the profounder subjects of the college course I tremble at the awful responsibility resting upon me. I often leave the class room oppressed with the thought of how easily a mistake might here be made and a wrong bias given to these developing minds, that might issue in hopeless unbelief. We therefore stand for church schools, for denominational colleges.

Then in the theological seminary we demand that the atmosphere and instruction here shall be truly reverent and profoundly spiritual. The theological instructor must have the scientific spirit as an educator, but in addition he must have the spirit of the Master. He must realize the sphere in which he teaches and the over-mastering importance of the subjects with which he deals, and he must do all his work in the glow of the deepest spirituality.

And now, in closing, suffer a few words bearing especially upon this institution.

1. This institution is the child of the Church. It was founded by some of the godliest men of our Church. The tears of God's people have fallen, and their prayers have ascended for this school. It belongs to the Church absolutely. It is greatly needed by our Lutheran Church on this territory. It has a magnificent mission. With proper care and support it may enter upon a larger career of splendid usefulness. The Church needs it. This part of the state needs it. The cause of higher education in these parts needs it. We are grateful to God for what has been accomplished by the men of God who have gone before. And we turn now to the Church for that sympathy and support needed to make it a truly great institution.

2. Again, this institution must stand for a high standard of education in college and theological school. As far as it goes it must insist on as thorough and comprehensive instruction as can be furnished anywhere. It dare not yield to a spirit that would lower the standard, nor make cheap its diplomas by easy courses. It must stand for high and thorough scholarship.

3. Then it must stand for a distinct and positive religious

spirit. It is well known as a Christian institution. This reputation it must sustain. It dare not give an uncertain sound on matters of positive religion. Its instructors must have at heart not only the intellectual advancement of their students, but their moral and spiritual good as well. Its class-room work must continue to include positive Biblical instruction. Its whole spirit and all its activities must be such as to send out thoroughly educated young men and young women imbued with the Christ spirit. To conduct it with this end in view, shall be the earnest endeavor of the speaker, so far as the influence and effort of the President can compass that end.

4. And, again, this institution must stand for true conservative Lutheranism. It has been founded by members of the General Synod in this country. It has been maintained with money from Lutheran Christians. It is conducted under the auspices of District Synods of the Lutheran Church. It is bound by its constitution and charter to the Lutheran Church. It appeals largely for patronage and support to our Lutheran people. It must be true to the genius, the spirit, the cultus, the theology of the Lutheran Church. It must therefore stand for historic, conservative Lutheranism. It was represented to the speaker that this was the positive attitude of this institution, when he was asked to accept its presidency. In view of that he accepted the charge. And yet we must state distinctly and positively that while we stand unequivocally for true, historic, conservative, Lutheranism, as we understand it, yet we do not stand for any parties or factions in the Church, and never with our consent or aid, whilst we occupy this position, shall this institution be used in any way in the interests of any faction or party in the Church, or to foment factional disturbances in our Church. It stands for the Church of our Fathers in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We believe this institution has a great work and a splendid field. It may do marvels for the cause of the blessed Master. Obeying, as I believe, the direct and unmistakable call of him, whose I am and whom I serve, I accepted the office of President of this institution. Relying alone upon him for guidance

and grace I have entered upon the discharge of my responsible duties. And seeking your continued sympathy and your unceasing prayers, and looking up to the Lord God Almighty for all needed wisdom and strength, I go forth to the work of Christian and theological education as represented by Susquehanna University. And may the rich blessing of the Great Head of the Church be upon the institution and upon those charged with its conduct. Amen!

ARTICLE VI.

MELANCHTHON'S GREEK LETTER TO CAMERARIUS, JUNE 16, 1525.

By Rev. W. A. Lambert, A. M.

Isaac Disraeli in that delightful book of sketches, 'Curiosities of Literature,' has devoted a few interesting pages to a subject on which several interesting volumes might be written: "Of Suppressors and Dilapidators of Manuscripts." It is bad enough for us to have before us Disraeli's question at another place in the same work, while reading volumes printed three or four centuries ago: "Are we to infer, by such frequent complaints of the authors of that day, that either they did not receive proofs from the printers, or that the printers never attended to the corrected proofs?" (Errata, I., 139, Am. Ed., 1862.)—a question to which we may infer the answer, that publishers took liberties with the text and hardly referred proof to the author, from Putnam's Books and their Makers in the Middle Ages, I., 385f. To have added to this a doubt arising from the work of editors who took liberties both in abbreviating and in altering, tends to make the student cautious and frequently skeptical. After all, much that is in print needs re-editing from original manuscripts, and frequently the manuscripts are either entirely destroyed or practically lost in archives and libraries difficult of access. In our day libraries are being ransacked, and archives opened wherever suspicion of treasure invites and the authorities do not for-

bid. In peculiar places strange discoveries are made, so that while we do grow somewhat cautious in using old books, we grow more hopeful for the recovery of original documents and correct statements, which may change present views of persons and history, but bring us nearer to truth.

To a re-discovered manuscript volume in the Chigi Library at Rome we are indebted for the correct version of a number of Melanchthon's letters, and incidentally for some light on the character of his biographer and friend, Camerarius. Although the volume was discovered twenty-five years ago and the information regarding it published almost as long a time, the fact that apparently the matter is practically inaccessible to English-reading men must be the excuse for its treatment here.

It would appear that Melanchthon was most unfortunate in regard to the publishing of his letters. Of the three men who first edited collections one was careless, the other two over-careful. Manlius who hastily puplished "without judgment and without selection" (Peucer) the letters he could find, as he tells in his preface, "written by various hands, sometimes also quickly copied from autographs in mutilated and incorrect shape," hasttened the publication of a volume of Peucer, the son-in-law of Melanchthon. Peucer severely condemns Manlius and asks that all who have letters written by Melanchthon send them to him rather than to "Manlius and other such blunderers." But the "judgment and discrimination" which he missed, is only too evident in his collection. He "neglected entirely to note those points which give an edition credit. He says nothing as to whether he had autographs or transcripts, whether others sent him autographs or only transcripts. He made bold not only to withhold some things which he was unwilling to have Melanchthon say, but also to change some things into a different sense. And that he had no special care to give the exact words of Melanchthon any one will see from the letters of which autographs or transcripts are extant to-day." (Bretschneider, Corpus Ref., I., 38).

The reputation of Camerarius as an editor seemed to be somewhat better. "Any one can readily persuade himself,"

writes the editor of the Corpus Reformatorum, "that Camerarius certainly did not cut out much, since in no other of Melanchthon's letters are to be found so many free and ingenuous judgments concerning kings, princes, courtiers, etc. Peucer makes no mention of Camerarius in his accusations against erroneous, careless editors. If, however, this edition had pleased Peucer, he would certainly have mentioned it; it must have displeased him, and perchance because he disliked that so many things were edited which could offer new occasion for the calumnies of Melanchthon's enemies, as, for example, the letter of Melanchthon on Luther's marriage and many others." But several changes made by Camerarius were known already to the editor of the Corpus Reformatorum, who notes that expressions were modified in the letter dated July 15, 1528, and that the system of dating was changed from the church calendar to the Roman.

The reputation of Camerarius was tolerably safe until the volume of Manuscripts, after an obscure history, was discovered by Wilhelm Meyer in the winter of 1874–5. How these letters passed from the family of Camerarius to that of the Chigi in Rome, no one can tell. The evidence indicates that they passed through the hands of a son of Camerarius, in October 1623 were taken from the castle of Heidelberg to Munich, and from Munich came unto the hands of the Chigi, either having been presented to them or bought by them. An Italian had eagerly studied the letters and made a full index to all but the German letters, which he could not read, and had them all bound in the form in which they were found. But he knew nothing of the printed edition, bound his index with the originals, and restored both to obscurity. (cf. Wilhelm Meyer, *Letters of Melanchthon to Camerarius*, etc., in the Reports of the Munich Academy of Sciences, 1876, pp. 596ff., and v. Druffel, *The Melanchthon Manuscripts of the Chigi Library*).

An examination of the Manuscripts and a collation with the printed edition revealed the fact that the alterations in the letter dated July 15, 1528 were not isolated instances of editorial correction. It showed that "the *accurate consideratione editus* of

the title page referred not to the ordinary labor of an editor. Camerarius in preparing the letters for the press by no means strove after the most accurate reproduction of the original. Much rather the products of Melanchthon's mind appear with manifold alterations, additions and omissions. Camerarius, to say it in a word, freely interpolated." (v. Druffel, p. 2.)

The motives of Camerarius in making alterations were numerous. Of least importance is the class of changes due to the classical taste of the humanist editor; the polishing of style, uniforming the orthography, insertion of classical words in place of barbarisms, the the change of calendar,—except the last changes which perhaps any editor would in those days have felt free to make, for not making which Manlius seems to be taken to task by Peucer. From these rather harmless alterations we come to the substitution of indefinite pronouns for proper names and of proper names for indefinite terms. Finally we have the most important changes in modifications affecting the sense, intended to soften expressions, and frequently producing direct contradictions of Melanchthon's meaning. We thus see that classical accuracy, and a regard for men's reputations influenced Camerarius throughout.

By far the most interesting of the letters thus rediscovered in its original form, is the Greek letter concerning Luther's marriage, which alone was published in full, and which illustrates most of the points above noted. It was published with notes, mainly consisting of the variations of Camerarius' text, by Meyer in the article above quoted. The text of Camerarius is found in his collection (p. 33) and in the Corpus Reformatorum, I., 753, with a Latin translation, the latter also appearing in Camerarius p. 772 and in Pezel, *Melanth. Consiliis* I., p. 37. The following translation is made from the text given by Meyer, and in the notes are given the variations of Camerarius marked C.

"To Joachim Camerarius, *Bambergensi amico summo.*

Greeting. Inasmuch as rumor is about to bring you various (disagreeing) reports concerning the marriage of Luther, it has

seemed good to me to write to you,* as I have knowledge concerning it. On the thirteenth day of June without warning Luther married Bora, revealing his purpose to none of his friends beforehand, but inviting to supper Pomeranus and Lucas the painter,† and Apellos‡ only, he performed the customary ceremonies.§ You may wonder|| that at this unfortunate time, when good and noble men are always distressed, this man does not¶ suffer with them, but rather as it seems lives softly and lowers his reputation,** when Germany most needs his noble-mindedness and power.†† But I‡‡ think these things happened somewhat in this way. The man is extremely easily influenced§§ and the nuns plotting against with every art, drew him to them. Very likely the being much with the nuns softened him, or even inflamed him too,|||| although he is noble and highminded. In this way it seems (to me) ¶¶ that he fell into this unseasonable marriage (change of life). But the rumor that he also had before*** * * * her is evidently a lie. But now it behooves us not to take grievously what has been done and to make reproaches. But I believe he was necessi-

*C. inserts 'the truth concerning this matter, and.'

†C. 'the painter from life'—portrait-painter.

‡C. 'the lawyer Apellos'—Apell.

§cf. Köstlin, Leben Luther's, I., 768, for the ceremonies, and also for the reasons leading to the selection of the three men named.

||C. 'one might perhaps wonder.'

¶C. 'is not able to.'

**C 'but seems almost like one who cares nothing at all for the prevailing evils, even his reputation being lowered.'

††Meyer suggests for 'power,' 'free time,' evidently unhampered by home life. C. 'dignity' or 'reputation.'

‡‡C. 'I indeed.'

§§Köstlin: "Zu leicht sich fortziehen lassen;" Schaff: "very reckless."

||||The word is slightly uncertain.

¶¶'to me' seems to have been written, but cancelled.

***The stem of the verb is entirely illegible. Meyer gives this note: "Erasmus wrote on Dec. 24th, 1525, 'Diebus a decantato hymenaeo ferme quatuordecem enixa est nova nupta' (Opera, Leiden 1703, III., E. 781); but he was honest enough to confess in a writing dated March 13, 1526 'De partu maturo sponsae vanus erat rumor, nunc tamen gravida esse dicitur.'" cf. Schaff, p. 459.

tated to marry by nature.* And this life [married life] is lowly indeed but it is holy and pleases God more than the unmarried state.† And because I see Luther himself somewhat sad and disturbed by the change of life, I will endeavor with all zeal and thought‡ to cheer him up, since he has never done anything that I consider worthy of accusation or that seems inexcusable. And I still have some evidences of his piety, so that it is impossible to condemn him. Then, too, I would rather have prayed that he be humbled than that he be exalted and lifted up, which is dangerous not only to those in the temple, but to all men.§ For faring well becomes the start of evil thinking

*C. substitutes from 'the man is': The man is by no means a misanthrope or unsociable. But you are not ignorant of his customary daily life, so that it seems better for you to think the rest than that I should write it, so that it is nothing wonderful that the nobleness and great souledness of the man was softened; especially since that which has happened is by no means open to reproach or blame. But if anything else more indecent is rumored, that this is a lie and slander is evident. But I believe that he was necessitated to marry also by nature.

†C. This life is lowly indeed but holy as any other, and the married state is said to be worthy in the Holy Scriptures. But we must take care that the unseasonableness and unpremeditated character of the deed, for such it seems to be, in which the generous and fault-finding zeal of the enemies will certainly delight, does not disturb us also. For beneath this there is probably something both mysterious and more divine, concerning which we must not be too curious; nor ought we to worry about the nonsense of some who jest and rail, and exercise neither piety toward God, nor virtue toward man.

‡C. reads 'benevolence', a change not noted by Meyer. Is Meyer's reading a misprint? That of Camerarius certainly is easier.

§C. substitutes from 'since he has never': Nor would I at least dare to condemn this as a fault, although God shows us many faults of the old-time saints, because he wishes us when in trouble to make not the reputation or person of man our counsellor, but his word alone. And again he is most impious who because of the fault of the teacher condemns the teaching. But I, as I have said, do not consider that he has here done anything inexcusable or even altogether worthy of condemnation. And I still have many clear evidences of his God-loving piety, so that those who insult and slander Luther do nothing else than the work of sycophants and buffoons, collecting from all places all things that may supply the slander of a shameless tongue. But, as far as I can see at least, the occurrence will not be unprofitable in bringing as it were some humiliation, since to be exalted and lifted up is always dangerous not only, etc., (ending as above).

not only, as the orator has said,* to the ignorant, but also to the wise.† In addition to this, I also hope that this life (married state) will make him more solemn, so that he will also lay aside the buffoonery‡ for which we have frequently blamed him.§ For according to the proverb a change of life will produce a change of manner. These things I write you at full length so that you may not be too much disturbed|| by the unexpected occurrence.¶ For I know that you are concerned for the reputation of Luther, which now you will be grieved to think lessened. But I beseech you to bear these things mildly, for the married state is said in the Holy Scriptures to be a holy state. And it is likely that he was necessitated truly to marry. Many mistakes of the old time saints God has shown us because he wishes us when in trouble to make not the reputation or person of a man our counsellor, but only his word. And again, he is most impious who because of the mistake of the teacher condemns the teaching.**

"The company of Michael†† is very pleasant to me in these troublous times; I wonder that you suffered him to leave you. Treat the father most dutifully, and consider that you owe him

*C. says:

†C. adds: at times.—The quotation is from Demosthenes, 16, 2 and is given in Liddell and Scott's Lexicon, under '*aphorme*' (ἀφορμή)

‡The word is not clear in the Manuscript. Köstlin gives it as 'eine ihm eigne Sucht grober und loser Spässe', and remarks: "This last remark reminds us of a tendency which is not to be denied in Luther the monk and peasant's son, and of a delicacy (Zartgefühl) which was especially characteristic of Melanchthon on this point."

§C. omits this sentence, and begins the following with: In all men, according to the proverb, etc.

||C. and disheartened. C. has also changed the number and tense of the verb: we have written.

¶C. has changed the order of words and substituted *sumbantos* for *pragmatos*,—a change not noted by Meyer.

**C. substitutes for the entire passage beginning 'For I know', most of which he has transferred to other parts of the letter, the single sentence: For I know that you are concerned for the good fame of Luther, and that he remain blameless and without reproach.—With this ends the Greek letter, what follows is in Latin.

††C.: of your men,----with the corresponding change of pronoun the 'you' also being changed from singular to plural.

this thanks for his fatherly love—to love him also in return.* Concerning Franconian affairs I await letters from you. Farewell. The day after Corpus Christi.†

The letter-carrier who brings these letters, is to return directly to us. PHILIP."‡

A careful comparison of the two versions will show that Camerarius largely used Melanchthon's thoughts, though not always his words, but shifted them from their original positions. (The corresponding passages are indicated in Meyer's notes). In a few places Melanchthon himself had made corrections, and in others Camerarius made changes in the Manuscript which do not appear in his printed versions; *e. g.*, where Melanchthon wrote 'nuns', Camerarius substituted 'some persons', etc. In a translation it is almost impossible to note such slight changes as the alteration of the order of words, and the improvement of spelling. All important variations are noticed above.

The original letter shows that Melanchthon "was at least for the moment completely put out by Luther's sudden move." (Köstlin I., 769). It "shows no respect for Katharine von Bora, and hostile feeling toward Luther," and bears the marks of conflicting emotions, "fear that the marriage of the monk and the nun would stir up new enemies for the Reformation, and a feeling of injury because Luther had taken so critical a step without consulting with him, the chief assistant in the work of the Reformation and without inviting him, his personal friend," and on the other hand "a dark feeling that Luther might after all have done right." (Meyer, 605). At the same time it gives evidence of the highest respect for Luther. Melanchthon was simply puzzled. The troubles of the Reformation weighed heavily upon him, and he could not understand the boldness of Luther, who could at such a time put to defiance all his enemies, and perhaps he was even more shocked at the apparent

*The last words are in Greek.

†C. omits the date here, and adds immediately before the signature: 'again, farewell. The 21st day of July, Anno 1525'----a mistaken transfer to the Roman Calendar, Corpus Christi of 1525 falling upon June 15, the letter thus being dated June 15.

‡The name is signed in Greek.

boldness of the nun, of whose rejection of Dr. Glatz and suggestion that she would not object to marry Amsdorf or Luther he probably knew. He seems also to have still harbored a certain feeling of the unworthiness of marriage, against which his head protested, but over which it could not quite triumph. It might almost seem strange to us that Melanchthon could be so ignorant of Luther's intention, since he had evidently given fairly plain hints of it in his letters to his friends. (Cf. Köstlin I., 763ff.). But of these Melanchthon could know nothing. Advice Luther sought from no man. "A man must ask God for counsel, and pray, and then act accordingly." (Quoted in Schaff, 458). Marriage was to him too delicate a subject to speak of, and he knew the dangers of many counsellors and of delay (see Köstlin, I., 766). Luther himself was almost surprized by his own deed: we need not then blame Melanchthon if he was led to use rather strong terms. The warning of Meyer needs to be remembered: "He who would rightly judge and not hatefully misuse the recovered genuine wording of that confidential letter to the most trusted friend, must consider the day and the circumstances under which it was written."

With the original before us we cannot do otherwise than regard Camerarius a bungling editor. In his preface he had expressed the desire that the originals be preserved, as though utterly indifferent to his own reputation. He mutilated a letter which he might with less offence have suppressed altogether; and in his mutilations bungled so badly that it is amazing that no one suspected the 'pious fraud.' By far the worst slip is the false date, which would have betrayed him had men seriously examined it. That Melanchthon should give the rumor concerning Luther's marriage over a month's start, and then expect to outstrip it with a letter, is altogether unimaginable. That after a month's time for thought, and acquaintance with Luther's new life and with Katharine, he should still be alarmed for the consequences, and doubt the correctness of the move, is at best improbable. Altogether inconceivable is the sending of such a letter on July 21, when we find that Melanchthon urged Wenzeslaus Link to attend the wedding festivities on June 27, him-

self attended on that day, and could indulge in jests on Schurf, "who would have new matter for disputation." (Köstlin, I., 770). Evidently Camerarius was interested in the publication of the letter, but also in the suppression of some of its features. The reason for the latter are evident: for the former we may quote the passage which Meyer quotes to show the spirit in which Camerarius altered. Camerarius had three years before the publication of the letters written in his Life of Melanchthon: "From which (Luther's marriage) Philip took much occasion for grief, not because he condemned the deed, but because he saw that thereby occasion of railing more bitterly and speaking evil more freely was given to enemies and malevolent men, of whom Luther had many, and those rich and powerful, especially since he saw that those who would wish to rail were assisted and instructed by the time" (of the marriage). Camerarius, it appears, desired to furnish his authority for the statement, and hence could not suppress the letter. The change of date may have been simply a blunder, for it seems impossible that Camerarius could consciously and intentionally have affixed a date so out of harmony with the beginning of the letter—unless he intended through it to arouse the curiosity of future generations, which might lead to the discovery of the original.

ARTICLE VII.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

By Prof. David H. Bauslin, D. D.

The results of the advancing criticism of the Bible are now embodied in the two most recent "Bible Dictionaries," the one edited by Dr. Hastings, to which reference has already been made in this department of the Quarterly, and that edited conjointly by Rev. T. K. Cheyne, D. D. and J. Sutherland Black, LL. D. This last and latest addition to such publications is very appropriately dedicated to the memory of the late Professor Robertson Smith. It is in some respects his book, containing a good amount of his work. But more than this, the new "Encyclopedia Biblica" is his idea. He projected it on the completion of the last edition of the Encyclopedia Britanica. Prof. Smith gave much thought to the choice and distribution of the subjects to be treated, the preparation of minor articles and the carrying forward of the contemplated work. When however it became evident that he was not to be spared to proceed with the task himself, he passed it on to the two friends whose names now appear as the editors of the new work, viz., Canon Cheyne and Dr. Black, the one an Oxford professor and the other at one time the assistant editor of the "Encyclopedia Britanica." The work professes to be carried on as its originator would have had it, in consistency with his principles and methods, and in the spirit of his somewhat advanced scholarship. It is doubtful, however, whether in some things it has not gone beyond what Robertson Smith even would have regarded as wise or scientifically valid, and carried to an extreme not contemplated by himself certain critical principles and methods associated with his name and work as a biblical critic.

The main object of the new "Encyclopedia is a very definite one. It is to give us, we are told, no mere collection of useful miscellanea, but a survey of the contents of the Bible as illuminated by criticism—a criticism which identified the cause of religion with that of historical truth, and, without neglecting the historical and archæological setting of religion, loves best to trace the growth of high conceptions, the flashing forth of new intuitions, and the development of noble personalities, under local and temporal conditions that may often be to human eyes most adverse."

Its purpose as thus explained is certainly made good, in most particulars. The preface states that the sympathies of the editors are "upon the whole with what is known as 'advanced' criticism." Ample justice is done to the declared aim of the new work. The alleged conclusions of the "highest" of the critics are so cordially accepted that no one now need remain ignorant of the latest findings of modern critical methods, the most recent historical and archæological results and the very newest speculations that are being persistently urged upon public attention.

The editors display the usual condescension and ex-cathedra cock-suredness of their class. It may be with extreme difficulty that an ordinary man who still holds to some old-fashioned views about the Bible, can accommodate himself to such heights of hypothetical speculation as have been attained by such men as Canon Cheyne and Dr. Black. He should, however, be grateful for the gracious attitude constantly manifested toward the feebleness and slowness of his critical and religious movements by these gentlemen of the new "Encyclopedia Biblica." They are good enough to assure us that they have "no desire to 'boycott' moderate criticism when applied by a critic who, either in the form or in the substance of his criticism, has something original to say," and "that an 'advanced' critic cannot possibly feel any arrogance towards his 'moderate' colleague," because he himself "probably held not very long ago views resembling those which the 'moderate' critic holds now."

But we find that the views advocated in the new work, are

not to go unchallenged and to pass current as sound scholarship even in the Anglican Church, of which the Encyclopedia editors are members.

The Church Quarterly Review, in an exhaustive review sharply runs counter of certain of its conclusions. It points out that "much of the material in the Old Testament articles is spoilt by taking the accuracy of critical guesses for granted, and by assumptions instead of proofs in regard to many far-reaching theories of the processes which have been at work under divine guidance in the formation of the books of the Old Testament." "We encounter," it further says, "what are called results which seem to us to rest chiefly on the imagination of the writers, and which often betray a recklessness beyond the most advanced parts of Dr. Hasting's work." It charges that this new effort to set forth the results of the newest criticism "is full of most unwarrantable assumptions made over and over again without proof;" that it is likewise "full of the overweening confidence that sets the ingenious fancy of an individual against the sober tradition of the ages of the Spirit-guided Church;" that "even the critics themselves, it seems, are conscious of the unstable foothold afforded by the shifting sands of their own theories."

The radical and destructive character of these new and advanced critical hypotheses will be illustrated by a few instances that may be selected from many. "The Encyclopedia article on the Acts of the Apostles, for example is given by a pronounced rationalist, Professor Schmiedel of Zurich. It is an elaborate article of twenty sections, which he opens with the remark that it may be regarded as certain that the 'we' sections of that book are not written by the same writer as the other parts, and makes the outrageous charges against the later compiler of deliberately wishing to pass off the whole book as the work of an eye-witness, when it was not, and of treating the 'we' narrative freely in the process of combination. We may note again the statement that St. John 'is only the eye-witness, not the author of the fourth Gospel; so, in like manner, in the Apocalypse we may have here and there a passage that can be traced to him but the book as a whole is not from his pen,' together with the

significant assertion that 'Gospel, Epistles, and Apocalypse all come from the same school.' Professor Charles undertakes Apocalyptic Literature, and after ninety-six sections of very learned material concludes with the remark that 'some of these judgments are symply hypotheses; there is still room for indefinite study on these questions.' "

The same radical and destructive tendency is manifest in the recently published Biblical Introduction by Professors Bennet and Adeney. It is evinced in the former writer's treatment of the book of the prophet Isaiah. He is not content with a 'first Isaiah' for chapters I.—XXXIX., and a second for the remainder of the book, but imagines that he finds three groups of later additions and an historical appendix in the first part which are not by Isaiah; and the second part he divides between an exilic deutero-Isaiah and an imaginary and possibly complex "trito-Isaiah,' the author or authors of a collection of post-exilic prophecies.

As for Abraham, Prof. Cheyne regards part of the narrative as describing not so much an historical personage as an ideal type of character, part again as a result of very free treatment of the traditional material, and part as the historical kernel of the story, though containing allusions to more than one person. Remembering what the New Testament contains about Abraham one feels like asking what is gained by accepting Professor Cheyne's strange theories in the place of the living and actual figure of the patriarch who has been called "the father of the faithful." The progenitor of the faithful could hardly have been an unsubstantial dream or fleeting shadow.

The same critical radicalism comes to the front also in Dr. Cheyne's book on "The Christian Use of the Psalms." He is not satisfied with the present use of the Psalter in the Church of England, and thinks that there is an "urgent necessity for some speedy reform in the present use of psalms and Canticles." In some of the psalms he finds verses that are "displeasing or even offensive" while in others "there is often as most readers will think an embarrassing incoherence." "There is not a line in the Old Testament," says the Canon of Rochester, "which

was spoken with a conscious reference to Christ." The Magnificat appears to be a very worthy "expansion of biblical germs" which has "sweet associations," although the prevalent belief that it was uttered by the Mother of our Lord, is "very doubtful." There are some passages in "Imitation of Christ" which have "at least as much claim as many of the psalms to be sung in our churches," and "there are some passages too of our best poets which can hardly be placed far below passages of the Bible in the quality of inspiration."

Pages of such citation might be adduced, all of which would show that modern advanced biblical criticism manifests a marked disposition to depreciate the Old Testament. Its tendency at the present time is to discredit the Old Testament writings, utterly undermining its authority, destroying its historicity, and seriously affecting the credibility of its writers by plainly insinuating the charge of foisting upon a credulous and uncritical public, documents purporting to belong to a previous age and alleged to have emanated from ancient and venerated names of past history. By such pious fraud they gained currency for their own composition and authority for their own deliverances.

By way of compensation, we suppose, for the loss readers of the Bible thus sustain we are assured that the value of a document, credited by the moderately learned with inspiration, is entirely independent of its authorship. All this strikes us as a relapse into the ways of the older but completely vanquished Tübingen criticism. It is dogmatic and presumptuous in tone and totally disregardful of conclusions reached by some of the best accredited critical scholars of modern times.

Modern times have registered many attempts to find a place for religion in a scheme of evolution. One of the most recent of these attempts is that of Mr. Henry Rutgen Marshall, in his book entitled "Instinct and Reason." The author is well known as an expert among experts in psychology, a student who has won for himself by solid work a title to be listened to when he speaks on a subject which he has made his own. His book is full of clear criticisms, of helpful definitions, and suggestiveness,

so that the reading of it is attended with profit and pleasure. The evolution of the book is scientific evolution. Scientific evolution runs through the volume and leads up to the "Be religious" injunction at the close. The effort of the gifted author, to locate religion simply as an instinct and to find the essence of morality alone in the restraints imposed by society, ends, as all such efforts end, indreary disappointment and failure.

The *London Church Review* says in a really profound criticism of Mr. Marshal's views: "Let a man be, however, an evolutionist with imported ideals, be a moralist with an ideal ethical field (p. 377), have tolerably definite notions of who the good man is (p. 375), be a patriot loving, with all her faults, his own social group, then, in the hour in which the ethical field is rushed by Tammany, the good man chased out of Wall Street, and the social group pulses no more with the instincts of Yale and Harvard, he will cry aloud in the market-place for 'Religion' to come to his rescue. Religion will not stir a step for his calling.

"The recognition that religion is indispensable may lead man to choose between two alternatives: he may cling to his philosophy and resign himself to the consequences; or he may cling to the religion and abandon the philosophy. Where neither course is open, he may attempt some compromise or adaptation, develop some theory of the essentials of religion compatible with the conclusions of the scientific faith. This last is the course taken in this volume. It repeats the old dead saws. The essence of religion, we are told, is restraint (p. 328). Its maxim is, Know thyself. This thought is said to be traceable in Schleiermacher's 'feeling of absolute dependence,' in Hegel's 'knowledge possessed by the finite mind of its nature as absolute mind,' or in Kant's 'knowledge of our duties as Divine commands,' or Martineau's belief in a 'Divine Mind and Will ruling the Universe' (p. 329). The thought of them all is 'the suppression of our fallible wills to what we conceive of as a higher will.' Belief in a Deity, as usually found, is 'an attachment to,' a 'coincidence of,' not the essence of religious feeling; this essence is found in the restraint of individualistic impulses

by racial ones. In this consists what Evolution calls ethics or morals, and this, if it go to the entire life and to all the ethic impulses, is religion. Religion is an impulse to give value to them all, or, in other words, is the old 'Morality touched with Emotion' (p. 329). We are 'converted' when we alter our moral code, when we follow the new one with enthusiasm, when we ascribe the change to a voice not our own within us."

Prof. O. G. Brown, D. D., Professor of Church History in Vanderbilt University, in an article in *The Methodist Review*, the organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, agrees with the *Outlook* in looking upon the writings of the late Dr. Bruce, as constituting the most fruitful theological library produced by any writer of our generation. "In many respects," says Prof. Brown, "he has left behind him no equal." While not disposed to minify the value of the work of Dr. Bruce, we cannot help thinking that there is some narrowness of outlook in this extravagant estimate. There is about the later writings of this gifted Scotchman a growing spirit of concession which marks a decreasing value in his theological products, as he grew older. His later works give some force to the wrong conception that the "Gospel for an age of doubt" should best be a doubting or halting gospel.

Edward Von Hartman the distinguished "Philosopher of the Unconscious," is a keen observer of the signs of the times. He has recently spoken of the present religious outlook in a decidedly optimistic way for a pessimist. His reflections have gained wide currency in English publications. Von Hartman thinks that there are many indications pointing to a revival of a felt religious need among the people. The symbolical character of the most recent art, the attention given theosophic, occult and spiritualistic phenomena; evangelical movements and the success of the Salvation Army; the increasing religious coloring in the anti-Romish movement in Germany; the growing accessions of Catholic priests to the Protestant Church in France—in all these, and other signs, he sees indications of a quickened

religious spirit. Among many good things said, we find this,

"The present public is in many respects better educated and informed than that of any previous age; but in respect of religious and philosophic insight it is marked by shocking superficiality and lack of culture, because both have remained too long under the contempt of the spirit of the age for the ordinary man to feel any need of acquiring historic and scientific knowledge in these domains. The result is a sad dilettantism among those who feel themselves called to teach the rest and a repulsive incapacity of judgment among the masses, not only of the uneducated and half-educated, but also in the most highly educated circles of society. The more trivial and useless the wisdom proclaimed by wandering speakers and writers the more intelligent and worthy of approval it appears to hearers and readers, regardless of its being often enough only ancient errors that are warmed over for them or sentimental phraseology and hashed up ideas that are served up again. There is only one remedy for these evils; the public must again, following the lead of educated men, acquire more culture also in the domain of religion, in order to increase its capacity to judge and be able to see through and reject what is useless and untenable. That such culture could be philosophical and theological is hardly probable in view of the still prevalent agnosticism, but respect for historic research is still great enough to make a way for historic culture in the field of religion, if such research took popular forms and were possible without too much loss of time."

To the *Journal of Theological Studies* published by the Macmillan Co., in London and New York, the Rev. F. R. Tennant contributes a thoughtful paper on "The Theological Significance of Tendencies in Natural Philosophy." The object of Tennant's essay is to endeavor to give some account of these movements or tendencies of thought involved in the alleged controversy or conflict between theology and science. His conclusion is as follows: "It will scarcely be necessary at the end of this paper to indicate more fully than has here and there been limited the significance for theology of the tendencies of thought

with which it has endeavored to deal. They will doubtless be sufficiently obvious. It need only be added that movements converging from several sides, and largely from within science itself, point to an inevitable tendency of Natural Philosophy in a spirtualistic direction. It is a step certainly, but still a comparatively easy step, from Spiritualism to Theism. The movements here described have therefore a deeper significance than the removal of materialistic or naturalistic views long potent as obstacles of theology, though there would be much to be thankful for in that they suggest and point to a reconstruction of Natural Theology on spiritualistic lines, such as perhaps will permanently affect its relations and attitude to Natural and Rational Theology."

The *Theological Quarterly* published by the Lutheran Synod of Missouri contains a valuable contribution to Historical Theology, in an article written by Prof. Graebner and entitled "An Abused Dictum of St. Augustine." The abused dictum which has recently been misused by Cardinal Vaughan is this: "*Ego vero evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicae Ecclesiae commoveret auctoritas.*" A translation, which seems to have been made by the Cardinal, is thus given "I should not believe in the truth of Scripture unless the authority of the Catholic Church so bade me." Prof. Graebner shows that it is a familiar argument with St. Augustine to maintain the authenticity of the canonical Scriptures as established by the testimony of the primitive Church, and that in this sense only does he claim the authority of the Church in behalf of the canonical Scriptures as compared with spurious sacred books which claimed credence and apostolic dignity or divine authority while they failed to establish their authenticity and their canonical recognition by the same Church which recognized the canonical Scriptures as the inspired writings of Moses and the Prophets, the Apostles and Evangelists. Concerning the Romish abuse of this saying of Augustine this is said: "We know that the Romanists were rebuked five centuries ago by one of their most learned and influential

men of his day, Gerson, the great Chancellor of the University of Paris, for their abuse of this saying of Augustine, whose doctrine of the divine authority of the Scriptures is not based upon the authority of the Church, but upon his doctrine of the inspiration of Scripture, which might also be exhibited by many passages from his works. Augustine holds the Scriptures to be the word of God: and the word of God cannot receive its authority from the Church as the creator cannot receive his authority from the creature he has made."

In the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* Professor Henry C. Minton contributes a fine and scholarly article on "Authority in Religion." Contending claims are urged by the advocates of the various theories as to the seat of authority. The reason, the Church and the Bible, each has its advocates, while there are some who would make out a case by coördinating all these as the channel of God's truth to man. Romanists exalt a corporate Church with its continuous revelation: Protestants revere the Scriptures as the sacred oracles, while Rationalists make the reason in man the source of his knowledge of religious things. If the purely rationalistic position can be maintained then a special revelation is unnecessary and absurd. Speaking of this latter Prof. Minton well says: "No greater mistake can be made than to regard the reason as snubbed and dishonored by such a revelation from God. Indeed it at once addresses itself to that reason; it lays its evidences and presents its testimony before its court. It assumes that reason in man is identical with reason in God, from whom the revelation comes. It comes not crushing, but enlightening man's reason; not bruising but assisting it. It is because man is unable to grasp and find out the mighty truth of God that God reveals to man the treasure of his word. On this subject a few important points that are often overlooked are worthy of careful consideration. 1. The rational faculty in man is honored in that such a revelation is addressed to him. 2. The *judicium contradictionis*, the right to reject whatever is contradictory either in itself or to other known truth, is fully and freely accorded to man. 3. The

reason in man is not the origin but only the organ of truth which he knows. 4. The so-called truths of the reason are those for which it is indebted to revelation as their source: and indeed—especially in Christian lands and ages, where admittedly the loftiest truths prevail—to this special revelation. 5. It is fully granted that the content of every revelation, in order that the design of it may be accomplished, must conform to the standards of right reason and must take its place under the categories of human knowledge."

In an article on "The Church" in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, a timely truth well stated, is quoted from Dr. C. C. Tiffany: "In comparison with the dissentions of Protestantism, the bitter discords of the Roman Church compare like a blare of trumpets to the murmur of flutes. There is an external unity of law, but dissonance of thought and purpose which the most divergent sects of Protestantism cannot equal. The unity is the unity of the letter, which killeth, not that of the spirit which giveth life. Submission to authority is its keynote, not the kindly coöperation of varying forces toward one great end."

II.

GERMAN.

By Rev. S. Gring Hefelbower, A. M.

Seeberg's Review of the second half of the century in the "*Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*" for February of this year, is as follows:

16. The great political and social movements of the latter half of the century, *i. e.*, the struggle for greater freedom and the rise of the empire, and the wonderful progress in manufacture and trade, undoubtedly exercised a great influence on church life. "The practical tendency penetrated it."

17. The wonderful progress in natural science and the liberal arts, which characterized the age, led to the common conviction that "the material was the real and useful." "That is rationalism. As a theoretical system it was overcome quickly."

The desire for speculation and the courage to indulge in it disappeared rapidly in the second half of the century. Confidence in metaphysics waned. Criticism entered almost every field of learning. The reign of Hegel in theology was broken. Theology and philosophy were separated. Yet there were certain representatives of the old idealism and a few of an idealism of a more modern type. The great danger of the age was practical materialism. "Theoretical materialism has departed, but it has sent in its place seven other spirits that are seven fold more harmful than it was!" that bring ruin and devastation wherever they go. Their polluting touch is felt in "faith, and patriotism, in morality and marriage, and in the rearing of children."

18. The complaint is heard that science has aided this materialistic way of thinking. This is true in a sense. But taken more exactly science does not make history but follows it. It was natural that in an age of great political movements the powers that work in history should demand attention. Consequently social science advanced with giant strides, and though there were many things in it "incomplete, one-sided and warped" it has been of great use to man. In recent years the natural sciences undoubtedly hold the chief place in the intellectual life of the nation, because of the practical benefits they bring. Their motto is, "nil verum nisi quod prodest." The favorite dogma of the day, the Darwinian theory of development, we leave to the critics of natural science who are emphasizing more and more its hypothetical character. The common application of this theory to history, and especially to the history of religion, is very misleading, for the ideal factors of history "cannot be explained as products of development." There is present in these prevailing conceptions not only Darwinian materialism but also Hegelian idealism. Hegel gave us the idea that "all being is a becoming according to law, *i. e.*, a continuous development."

19. Schopenhauer's bald pessimism which was based on the doctrine that will was at the foundation of everything, was followed by the similar teachings of von Hartmann. Nitzsche's wild and effeminate speculations were also felt in this period.

20. During this half century all classes became more or less informed along all lines. Culture and general information were put within reach of the masses. This exerted a great influence upon the course of events in the history of the nation. The complaint is made that realism, though it has produced much that is good in literature and art, is also responsible for much moral filth. Along these lines the present must be regarded as an age of transition.

21. The Church does not have the power it formerly had. At the beginning of the century the great mass of the people were still churchly. Much of the present day thought is hostile to the Church. The vast majority are indifferent to religious things. And when they think of Christianity they stumble at theoretical details. The ignorance of our religion is appalling. It would seem that the time for a prophet has come. Preaching has degenerated greatly. Yet we have good reason to be hopeful.

22. The religious instruction of the young is poor compared with what it should be, which accounts for a part of this ignorance. Catechization does not suffice.

23. The administration of the affairs of the Church (though it has ceased to be an arm of the state) is yet in a period of transition.

24. The power of the Church is the gospel in the sense of the Reformation. However, in spite of the victory for evangelical faith in the first decades of this century, the old rationalism, continued and made itself felt from time to time. An association (Protestantenverein) was formed, which for a while exercised considerable power, but its influence waned. It appears in the controversy concerning the Apostolicum. The sects (Methodists and Baptists) influenced the church life more than its theology, though in some thing they sought to correct and improve its doctrine. But all that men claim to have learned from Methodism they could have learned from Luther. And that which this sect has that is not found in Luther is generally bad.

25. In doctrinal theology Philippi and others attempted a reproduction of the 17th century dogmatics. This school is

dead. Then there was the Biblical Dogmatics of Beck and his followers whose last representative was Keubel The chief advotates of the liberal theology were Strauss, Biedermann, Schweitzer, Lipsius and Pfleiderer, who aimed at the reconciliation of Chisitianity and culture, of revelation and speculation and at the resolution of dogmas into general speculative truths.

26. The orthodox elements centered in the "union" or in the confession and in common held to the authority of Scripture and to dogma. They learned from Schleiermacher not only religious elements but also a regard for doctrines as churchly.

The "Mediating Theology," which had its beginning about 1830, at first tried to do away with confessional difference. The leaders were Julius Mueller, Dorner, Martensen, J. P. Lange, Tholuck and above all R. Rothe. They really did not deserve the name "mediating," for they were positive men, who preserved to theology its scientific character and held it in the right relation to modern culture.

27. In conservative circles the notion prevailed more and more that confessionalism in theology was to be won inwardly and that it was not bound to the old orthodox systems. The Erlangen theology showed this in its subjective starting point for dogmatics. Its goal was strict confessionalism. But its method was very different from that of the old systems. Von Hofmann was the founder of this school, and though many of his views are not held now, his influence still lives as a powerful factor in theology. Thomasius and Luthardt, though independent of him in many things belong to this school. Frank was its greatest dogmatician. In everything he received his impulse from Von Hofmann, but in many doctrines he followed his own independent course. "With wonderful talent for systematizing he developed his thoughts in detail. But he was also careful to approach in them the churchly doctrines, although he always emphasized strongly the freedom of investigation."

28. Next to Schleiermacher the greatest dogmatician of the century was Albrecht Ritschl, who, though to a great extent original and independent, absorbed many things from such diverse sources as Schleiermacher, Baur and Von Hofmann and by

his wonderful learning wrought them into that system which bears his name. His method was similar to Von Hofmann's but his conclusions were very different. Men at once hailed this as a "new dogma" fraught with great blessings for the Church. Science and dogma would be reconciled. During the last decades of this century the cry was: "For or against Ritschl?" But the hope proved to be vain. Ritschlianism has its zenith both in development and influence behind it, and not even the beginnings of the expected change have appeared. Many followed after it. But now they must turn away either to the right or to the left. "Both Ritschl and Von Hofmann go back to the impulses received from Schleiermacher. After all, this is the history of the systematic theology of the century, Schleiermacher's ideas triumphed, but in such a way that they were always brought over more energetically into that which was positive and churchly." Thus in the field of dogmatics the century closes with questions: "How shall we teach old thought," is still asked. Perhaps the cry, "back to Luther" hints at an answer. But this comes from a "proper understanding of history."

"A dogmatik that does not merely admit this historical sense but energetically demands it, a dogmatik that is thoroughly biblical and positive and therefore through and through religious and practical, a dogmatik that is not afraid of the stern consequence of thoughts and that is also able to assist the sermon, will be the dogmatik of the future. May our generation see it."

29. During this period the New Testament has been studied thoroughly. Great commentaries have appeared. Von Hofmann's was epoch making. The life of Christ and the apostolic age have been gone over carefully time and time again. New Testament theology also received much attention. But the chief interest centered in the questions of introduction raised by Baur. His positions are now given up almost universally. Zahn's recent Introduction is the greatest reply to him and stands as a boundary stone in the history of this New Testament science. In the Old Testament Wellhausen's questions have not been answered. Everything is chaos. There is no

generally accepted result. However, it looks as if that conception of the Old Testament that Hengstenberg and Keil advocated is overcome and that historical criticism is here to stay.

30. In church history the idea of development influenced many minds. This period marks a great advance in our knowledge of every age of the Church. Yet, in spite of the fact that men like Köstlin, Kolde, Dieckhoff, Plitt, Th. Harnack, Kawerau, Brieger, Tschackert, *et. al.*, have written on the Reformation and kindred themes, that period has no such masterpiece as Hauck on the Middle Ages, or Ad. Harnack and above all Zahn on the Early Church.

This age has also been very fruitful in important contributions to the history of doctrine, for which Baur gave the chief impulse. Thomasius' great work marked an epoch. According to him. "the goal of doctrinal development is Lutheranism." Ritschl, in his great work, made Lutheranism not the last link in the chain (Thomasius) but rather the first link. Ad. Harnack's text-book had as its guiding star the principle that all "dogma is a conception of the Greek spirit on the basis of the gospel." Seeberg's text-book follows this principle: "Dogmas are not true because they are accepted by Lutheranism. But they are also not untrue because they are conceived in Hellenistic forms of thought."

31. The history of the practical side of Christianity during this period is perhaps the brightest page in the history of this century.

32. The 20th century is born amid the clouds of "Social Democracy." And its ideals foster an irreverent disrespect for history, religion and all authority. Some progress has been made toward solving the problem but there is a great deal that this century leaves as an unpromising legacy to the coming generations.

33. In 1854 Rome promulgated the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and in 1870 that of Papal Infallibility. Soon after this she lost her political power. Yet it must be said that along lines of external development Rome has steadily advanced. But there has been an inward decline that is propor-

tionately great. The fruits of the Spirit are lacking. It is true she is overcoming the world, but she is doing it with worldly weapons.

Thus the new century finds us with unanswered questions in almost every field. The enemies of Christianity are more pronounced in their opposition, but the Church has a clearer and more powerful sense of its duties in the world. It will be given some of us to labor in the new age—let us remember that all change in course of events is from God and will in some way serve his kingdom and that man's greatest inheritance is faith, the feeling and experience of the authority and power of the living God, which it is our duty to maintain.

Budde of Strassburg recently published a pamphlet on the so-called Ebed-Jahveh songs of Deutero-Isaiah, in which he takes a very decided stand against the widely accepted theory of Duhm, that these parts are to be excluded from the text and that the servant himself, as mentioned in these passages, is to be regarded as an individual. Giesbrecht, Schmend and a number of others hold essentially the same position. Prof. von Orelli, in a review of Budde's pamphlet, assents very heartily to his assertion that chapters 40–55 are a part of Deutero-Isaiah and not an interpolation, but claims that the assertion that the "Servant of the Lord" is nowhere other than the Children of Israel is not and cannot be proved. Budde teaches that the conception of "The Servant of the Lord" was formed from the calling or office of Israel as a people. According to von Orelli the author did not abide by this conclusion "but deepened it into the conception of the servant of Jehovah as one who is the chosen instrument of the Lord and brings to full realization the thoughts that he had deposited in Israel." In these passages the figure that appears to the reader is that of a personal individual whose peculiarities and activities could not be ascribed to an entire people. And further: "The Servant of the Lord" distinguishes himself most plainly from the empirical people of Israel when he enters into sharp opposition to it or when it is

represented as the chief object of his mission and activity. According to von Orelli, Budde, in attempting to explain away these difficulties, uses far-fetched theories and forces the text till it yields him what he wants.

Lic. Fuellkrug's larger pamphlet that appeared several months before Budde's is more conservative. With Budde he rejects the theory of interpolation. But he is just as positive in rejecting that interpretation of these passages which would make "The Servant of the Lord" the people of Israel and nothing more. He believes that the writer had in mind some martyr of his own or former times and pictured his sufferings but in a prophetic way; "thus narrative of real events and prophetic glances toward the future alternate." We have therefore genuine prophecy whose biblical theological meaning is very great. The entire passage as we have it was written after the return from exile by Deutero-Isaiah.

Professors Schlatter and Cremer, in their series of "Contributions to the Advancement of Christian Theology," published an interesting essay by Paul Wurm on "Riligious-historical paralels to the Old Testament." In the introductory paragraph he discusses the question, "why is the science of religion always treated from philosophical or speculative standpoints and not from the theological points of view, why everything of late is placed under the jurisdiction of the theory of evolution without even venturing an earnest attempt at testing the biblical view of the being and genesis of religion by the material at hand? "The author then contrasts the primitive forms of religion according to the Bible and evolution and thereby shows the decided superiority of the former. In the third chapter he concludes that the ancient giving of the law in Israel must have conveyed a great deal more than the very small residuum that modern criticism leaves us. In the last chapter Christianity is presented as the "only redeeming universal religion." Among other things he calls attention to the fact that in Mohammed such a Messias came as the false Messianic hope of the Jews yearned for.

In Marti's Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament Bertholet contributes the volume on Ruth, in which he represents the writing of the book as the result of a tendency. By the example of David, among whose ancestors was a Moabitish woman, a strong veto was entered against the severe treatment of mixed marriages that was demanded in Ezra IX. and X. and in Nehemiah XIII, 23 *et. sq.* The book is accordingly a plea for tolerance.

In this same Commentary Budde treats Lamentations. He regards chapters III. and IV. as the oldest portions of the book and ascribes them to one author who lived about the time of the fall of Jerusalem and wrote them (more likely in Palestine than in Babylonia) some time after misfortune overtook some patriot. The first chapter is weaker in form but is more advanced it its religious conceptions and gives expression to the feeling of penitence that is dated after the exile. It is more or less dependent upon Deutero-Isaiah and was written about 530 B. C. or perhaps a little later. The fifth chapter is really not a lamentation. It pictures the frame of mind of those Jews that remained behind in Palestine, and was written about 550 B. C. The third chapter is really the newest portion of the book and springs from about the third century B. C.

In Nowack's series of O. T. commentaries Siegfried makes the contribution on Ecclesiastes. The most striking novelty in this work is his attempt to prove the book to be a literary mosaic whose component parts he essays to distinguish. Some pessimistic philosopher wrote a pessimistic treatise in which he contests the rightness of the traditional Jewish faith and concludes that "all is vanity." All striving after wisdom is therefore purposeless. This unbiblical pessimism can be explained only by assuming the influence of Grecian philosophy, probably that of Stoicism. The name Solomon that was attached to this fundamental writing saved it. Then another wrote who was a happy dispositioned man, a friend of pleasure. There was a third contributor. And then there was a fourth contributor who tried to redeem the wisdom of the first writer from the contempt in which it was held. A fifth contribution was made by

some one before the final redactor edited the book. Wilderboer, who writes on this book in Marti's Commentary, makes it rather "the honest confession of an honest man who doubts much that other persons easily believe but who, for this reason, is not ready to yield the faith of his childhood." Both writers agree in finding plain traces of Grecian philosophy in the book as we now have it.

Wilderboer contributes the volume on Esther in Marti's Commentary. He advocates the long-established theory as to the purpose of the book, that it was written to explain the origin of the Feast of Purim. But Wilderboer departs from many of his brother critics in tracing the Esther legends to a primitive Babylonian–Elamitish epos. Esther is traced back to Isthar, Mordecai to Marduk and Haman to Humman, the national god of the Elamites. In Babylonia at New Year the was a feast that celebrated a certain victory of Marduk. While the Jews were in Babylonia they learned to know this feast "and spread over it a Jewish mantle" and it became the Feast of Purim. There are also traces of the Persian New Year feast to be found in the Jewish Purim.

At the Meissen Conference, May 14th and 15th, Prof. Rietschel of Leipzig discussed the necessity of a union of the German evangelical state churches. The necessity arises from the growth of the Roman Catholic Church, the parliamentary lawmaking, which is often very injurious to the evangelical cause, the presence of the sects and the pressing need of an evangelical nurture in the colonies. But care must be exercised in forming this union that the thought of a German national church may not appear. General altar fellowship should not be obligatory. There should be no union in constitution, no union in cultus, no union in confession. It should be a voluntary confederation with full independence of the several state churches in the things just mentioned. The address was well received and resolutions were adopted looking toward a furtherance of the plans suggested.

ARTICLE VIII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

Foreign Missions of the Protestant Churches. By Stephen L. Baldwin, D. D. pp. 272. $1.00.

This volume is a very valuable hand-book on Foreign Missions. The author was well qualified to write such a work from his long familiarity with missionary operations. His own prefatory note is a very excellent epitome of what he has done. The object of the volume, he tells us, is, "to present some of the principles which underlie the missionary work of Protestantism, to discriminate between conceptions of missionary work that are true and those that are false, to consider the call and the qualifications of the missionaries, briefly to treat of some of the methods by which the missionary work of the Church is managed, and to give brief outline summaries of the work of the numerous societies engaged in it." Dr. Baldwin has collected and condensed into a few pages a wealth of missionary information appending carefully prepared statistical tables. He is to be congratulated on giving Protestant readers an excellent hand-book. H. C. ALLEMAN.

Christ Came Again. The Parousia of Christ a Past Event, the Kingdom of Christ a Present Fact, with a Consistent Eschatology. By William S. Urmy, D. D. pp. 394. $1.25.

The purpose of this volume is explained by its sub-title. The author holds, and seeks to prove, that the "Parousia," so often spoken of in the New Testament, "took place about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem." This he proceeds to argue from the words of Christ and his apostles, from the great eschatological discourse of our Lord and from the Apocalypse. The author lays down his own premises—our Lord spoke of *one* event, not two; the personal hopes of the apostles of an early coming of the Lord were fulfilled; the Apocalypse speaks of events which are now past—and then advances to a logical development of his system. Nineteen chapters, two-thirds of the book, are devoted to the exposition of this "Preterist" theory of the eschatological Scriptures. Of course the entire eschatological system commonly accepted is reconstructed. "The resurrection" occurs at death and is immediately followed by the "judgment," which is neither future nor general The millenium, also, he claims is past and "the new Jerusalem is the triumphant church of the Lord Jesus Christ"—on earth, not "in its glorified condition." The volume has the advantages of clearness, conciseness, logical arrangement. H. C. ALLEMAN.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Life of Jesus of Nazareth. A study by Rush Rhees, Prof. of New Testament Interpretated in the Newton Theological Institution. With map. 320 pages. Cloth bound. Price $1.25 net.

This is Vol. VII. of the "Historical Series for Bible Students." The author has not attempted to add another biography of Jesus to the wealth of literature on that subject; he has rather produced a study which is to be supplemental to the reading of the four Gospels. In a consideration of the Bible story of Christ, certain questions of vital interest are presented. These the author seeks to answer in an unargumentative way and without technical discussion. Students are sometimes disposed to approach Scripture from their own doctrinal positions. On such questions, the book takes a non-committal attitude, and personal theories are not intruded. As the apostles knew Christ first as a man, and gradually progressed from the human to the divine as he revealed himself to them, so the author presents to the mind the Man Jesus, and then, as the Gospel story proceeds, God revealed in Christ. The personal Lord is brought before the reader, not an accepted doctrine. The matter of the book is divided into numbered sections, thus making it an admirable assistant in the Bible class. A valuable appendix furnishes references for more extended study.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

Faith and Sight: Essays on the "Relation of Agnosticism to Theology." By William Pierson Merrill. pp. 175. Price $1.00.

If this is the work of an American layman, which I fancy it is, then it is a very happy sign of the times. England has scores of laymen who have written learnedly and interestingly on religious subjects but it must be confessed that in the way of theological writing the laymen of America have made but slight contribution to our apologetic and constructive theology.

Mr. Merrill has given us in these eleven short essays a highly important and interesting treatment of a vital and timely problem *i. e.*, the relation of a legitimate agnosticism in the scientific interpretation of the universe, to the religious and Biblical method of accounting for the cosmic and psychical facts of existence. There is much that is admirable both in the spirit, purpose and writing of his thought-provoking book, but there are two fundamental points from which I must dissent. First, he certainly concedes far too much to the agnostic position in its denial of our ability to apprehend the nature and work of God. Recognizing as he does the three types as illustrated by Huxley, Darwin and Arnold, he says of the attitude in general: "The agnostic's position may be fairly stated thus: positively, that there is an infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed, and which makes for righteousness; negatively, that no more absolute knowledge can be had of this energy than its existence and its tendency. It denies that we

can predicate of it will, intelligence, or emotion; declares in a word, that while we can know *that* God is, we never can know *what* God is, for all our means of knowledge fall short." * * * "Every attempt on our part to define God beyond the agnostic conception issues in contradiction and inconsistency."

One feels in reading such a surrender that our author has failed in maintaining a splendid defence at two points. He certainly does not know the best which has been written on the doctrine of the "relativity of knowledge." I venture to say he has not studied the position of Dr. John Caird in his *Philosophy of Religion.* This is no place to shatter the destructive claims of Spencer's doctrine of relativity, but any man of metaphysical cast who will follow Dr. Caird through the first three chapters of his book must logically reach his decision—"The proper conclusion from the doctrine of relativity as held by Mr. Spencer and kindred writers, is, not that the Absolute is unknowable, but that no such being exists, or, what comes to the same thing, that the assertion of its existence is meaningless," and for Dr. Caird's own position: "It is because we conceive of the unknown not as 'a mystery absolutely and forever beyond our comprehension,' but, as containing more of what is admirable to us than we can grasp, because our intelligence is confronted by an object which is immesurably above it in its own line, that there is awakened within us a sense of our own littleness in contrast with its greatness." If I dare formulate my own reply in propositions I would say 1. The notion of finitude implies the fact of an infinite. 2. God can not be less than a person—personality being the highest thing we know of in existence. 3. God can not be less than a holy being—the source of all finite righteousness. 4. God can not be less than human love—for he is the fount of all social affection. 5. Because I can not fully *comprehend* him, that does not debar a large *apprehension* of his being and purpose. One feels indeed that Mr. Merrill would be further profited by a rigorous study of modern theism under a competent master.

Secondly, I am sure he has confused the function of what he is pleased to call "subjective theology with philosophy of a certain type," and ignores the historical basis of essential Christianity. For instance I do not like his designation of theology. "The true function of theology may be thus stated: So to interpret the facts which science discloses as to afford a rational basis for the religious instinct." Certainly this leaves out of the count the most important material of Christian theology. The omission of the historical facts—the Incarnation of the Eternal Word in Jesus Christ, his words, his vicarious suffering and expiatory death. His resurrection, ascension and gift of the Holy Spirit are data which no theologian can ignore in justifying the religious instinct and religious history of the race. Revelation is as rational, from a psychological point of view, as the inductive method in the scientific investigation of fossils. As Dr. Caird says: "A God who does not re-

veal himself ceases to be God." It is true as Mr. Merrill contends that the "subjective" theology has often failed to appreciate and accept the proven facts of the "objective" theologian—the agnostic. It is true the religious dogmatist has not "deanthropomorphized" his notions of the Deity as rapidly as the march of science and a "spiritual anthropormorphism" demands. But the divorce which he establishes between the rationalizing function of the soul and its faith function is unsatisfactory. They are forever joined together in the life of every well-balanced soul.

He claims that the modern poets Browning and Tennyson are the true theologians of our era, though equisitively written chapters hardly satisfy the philosophic convictions of a Christian thinker.

E. H. DELK.

Luther and the German Reformation. By Thomas M. Linsday, D. D., Professor of Church History, F. C. College, Glasgow. 12mo. pp. XXII. and 300. 1900. $1.25.

This book belongs to "The World's Epoch-Makers" series, edited by Oliphant Smeaton. The volumes entitled "Cranmer and the English Reformation," and "Wesley and Methodism," and this one are all of the series that have been yet published—a series so arranged as to present the biographies and achievements of the world's chief heroes of thought and action.

The book before us is a work of genuine historical merit. If it does not present anything new, it yet presents much in a new light, and causes the whole drama of the Reformation to pass before us in a beautiful pamoramic view. The book reminds us very much of the Worms Monument. Luther is the central figure, but his supporters and followers are gathered around him in symbolical and real relations. The whole picture seems instinct with life. Men and women appear to speak and act in our presence, and they all appear very human. Even Luther himself, "this king among men," is viewed as a man, and not as a demigod. But as exhibited in this book he is pre-eminently the man of action, rather than the man of thought—the man that sweeps away old traditions and tears down tottering systems and erects a monumental structure on tried foundations We have less of Luther as the theologian, the preacher, the poet than usual, ralatively more of Luther as the master spirit and intrepid leader of "the German Reformation," for this book is not a biography of Luther, but rather an exhibition of Luther in his connection with "the greatest revolution which Western Europe has ever seen." Hence we have here graphic descriptions of the corruptions of the Church in the early part of the sixteenth century, and of the political and social revolts that characterized the period.

What impresses us particularly as the author's intimate acquaintance with all the conditions of Germany in the sixteenth century. He has

so to speak, crept back into the very period of which he writes, and thence unfolds the scene of the German Reformation, and does not merely write about it. Hence as a life of Luther and as a history of the German Reformation, combined, the book fully vindicates its right to exist, and to have a place in the series of which it forms a part.

And yet the work is not perfect. Luther's relations to the Diet of Augsburg, and to the Augsburg Confession, are not adequately described; and the last ten or fifteen years of Luther's life and activity are too meagerly represented. On p. 47, Melanchthon is represented as "brought from Erfurt." It should be, Tübingen. On p. 55, Albert of Brandenburg (not "berg") is said to have "been archbishop of Magdeburg." He was at that time archbishop of Magdeburg as well as of Maintz. P. 75: Luther was summoned to present himself at Rome in sixty, not "sixteen" days; and Luther was not the official head of the University of Wittenberg in the summer of 1518. P. 215: There is no evidence that the Marburg Articles were presented to the Elector at Torgau in 1530. Neither were Luther and Melanchthon "busied at Coburg * * * in drafting a Confession.'" At Coburg an "Apology" was drafted. The idea of a "Confession" came only after the electoral party had reached Augsburg, May 2nd. P 254: Maurice, Duke of Saxony, was not "the nephew," but the cousin and son-in-law of the wife of Philip of Hesse, who was Landgrave, not "Margrave," p. 255. P. 277: It not true that the Torgau Articles were compiled by Luther, Melanchthon, Justus Jonas, Bugenhagen, and presented to the elector at Torgau. It is universally agreed among learned men, as has been shown in the *Lutheran Quarterly*, that the "so-called Torgau Articles" are the work of Melanchthon. Neither is it true that the Augsburg Confession was "revised by Luther." Prior to its delivery Luther saw only *der erste Entwurf* of the Confession, and refrained from making any changes in it. Philip of Hesse made no "protest against Article X. on the Lord's Supper in the *Invariata.*" He did express some dissatisfaction with the article, however. P. 279: Schmalkald Articles in 1537, not in "1557." *Bonus dormitat Homerus.* The book, though marred by these and similar inaccuracies, is one of the most sympathetic, intelligent, and appreciative popular treatises on Luther and the German Reformation that has come to our knowledge. It ought to have a place on the book-shelves of every Lutheran. More than any other book of its kind it "sets Luther in the environment of the common social life of his time." J. W. RICHARD.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

The Conception of Immortality. By Josiah Royce, Professor of the History of Philosophy at Harvard University, and Ingersoll Lecturer for 1899. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1900. Price $1.00.

We welcome this little volume, which comes as the Ingersoll Lecture

at Harvard for the year 1900, on the great question of man's immortality. It is welcome not simply because the theme discussed stands for a belief that has been spontaneous and deep in the religious hopes of humanity in all past ages and forms an integral part in the teachings of Christianity, but especially because there has been so much in the speculative thought of our day, particularly in connection with materialistic evolutionism, that has tended to suggest difficulties and to foster skepticism. This tendency is evidenced in the frequency with which the mere on-moving and elevation of the racial life is substituted for the idea of personal immortality. It has become no rare thing for naturalistic altruism to suggest that we should be willing and content to forego our individual immortality in the interest and improvement of corporate humanity. Under these circumstances, an affirmative presentation of personal immortality—for such the treatise is—by one of the most advanced and independent representatives of speculative and evolutionist thinking, is of more than ordinary interest.

Prof. Royce discusses the question altogether from the view-point of speculative science. He finds in this both the basis and the justification of the belief in man's continued personal existence after death. He discovers the foundation and warrant for the idea of immortality in the fact that each person is an "*individual*" being, whose existence expresses and carries a "*purpose.*" Through a long, but fine process of examination and illustration, the author unfolds the reality of such individuality and what is involved in it. Individuality stands in the fact that each man, to be himself, must be the person he is and not another. It does not consist in what he is *like* others, but in that in which he is different from all others—a uniqueness in which he is identical with himself, but with none else in the world. This individuality is the deepest truth in every man's existence. With this individuality the author connects the fact, just as clear and profoundly sure—"purpose." "I hold the conception of individuality to be not merely from our human point of view, but in itself, essentially and altogether, a teleological concept,—a concept implying that the facts of any world where there really are individuals express will and purpose." "An individual is a being that adequately expresses a purpose," "or so expresses a purpose that no other being can take the place of this individual as an expression of this purpose." "I conclude then, so far, that if this world contains real individuals at all, it is a teleological world, and a world that not only expresses a purpose, but completely and adequately expresses a purpose precisely in so far as it contains real individuals."

The individual consciousness discerns this purpose only fragmentarily and partially, but the partial discernment guarantees the full meaning and realization. Our author safeguards this point from the skepticism which the theory of pure idealism might suggest; and then consummates his argument in the conclusion that each individual life, with its inmost purpose, is one with the Absolute Life, with God. "Just be-

cause then, God is One, all our lives have various and unique places in the harmony of the divine life. And just because God attains and wins and finds this uniqueness, all our lives win in our union with him the individuality which is essential to their true meaning. And just because individuals whose lives have uniqueness of meaning are here only objects of pursuit, the attainment of this very individuality, since it is indeed real, occurs not in our present form of consciousness, but in a life that now we see not, yet in a life whose genuine meaning is continuous with our own human life, however far from our present flickering form of disappointed human consciousness that life of the final individuallity may be. Of this our true individual life, our present life is a glimpse, a fragment, a hint, and in its best moments a visible beginning."

There is, without doubt, in the essential features of this argument a valid and strong support to the great faith of man's immortality. Coming from so free and broad a thinker, it is specially valuable as showing how this common doctrine of religion vindicates itself anew to the critical intellect of our day. We can not but feel, however, that the argument would have become more surely valid and much stronger had it not been united in its last step, as it seems to be, with a monistic or pantheistic theory of the universe, but grounded in the Christian theism in which God creates human beings in his own "image and likeness," as his *children*, and therefore not to be blotted out of existence at the very threshold of the potency and promise which he has placed in their constitution. M. VALENTINE.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Dr. Martin Luther's Reformations-Schriften. Erste Abtheilung. Zur Reformationshistorie gehörige Documente. A. Wider die Papisten. Aus den Jahren 1517 bis 1524. Aufs Neue herausgegeben im Auftrag des Ministeriums der deutschen ev.-luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio und anderen Staaten. 4 to. 2647 columns. 1899.

This is the XV. volume of the superb recension of Walch by scholars of the Missouri Synod. It contains the documents against the papacy pertaining to the history of the Reformation covering the years 1517–1524, in some respects the most important period of the great conflict. It opens with a mass of official Bulls and other writings on Indulgences during the 14th and 15th centuries, and the editor justifies their introduction by the dark contrast they present to the glorious light of the gospel which Luther replaced on the candlestick, and by citations from Luther himself urging that such publications should be preserved for posterity, in order that the incredible and immeasureable craft of Satan which ruled the Court of Rome might serve coming generations as a useful and wholesome beacon.

Chapter I. is devoted to the Indulgence traffic. Chap. II. is occupied with Luther's opposition to this traffic, his 95 theses with their effects,

etc. Chap. III. contains the proceedings between the Papal Legate and Luther at the Augsburg Diet of 1518 including the *Acta Augustana.* Chap. IV. has the negotiations of Luther with Nuncio Carl von Miltitz. Chap. V. gives a complete account of the Leipsic Disputation. Chap. VI. the Papal ban with its consequences. Chap. VII. covers Luther's appearance before the Emperor at Worms, his condemnation there and his concealment at the Wartburg. Chap. VIII. the changes, good and bad, which sprang up at Wittenberg in Luther's absence, and the conflict between him and Carlstadt. Chap. IX. includes everything pertaining to the two Nurenberg Diets of 1522 and 1523 and the results of the latter.

Considerable matter embracing Luther's controversy with Eck at Leipsic and some 200 of Luther's letters have been translated anew from the Latin for this edition.

While the arrangement of Walch is closely followed there are numerous and important corrections especially in the matter of dates and in the titles given by Walch to Documents. So also a most welcome chronological index of Documents and of Luther's letters is provided.

As has been stated before by the reviewer, too much praise cannot be accorded to the editors for the minute fidelity to truth revealed in the editing of this magnificent edition of Luther, nor to the publishers for its unsurpassed mechanical execution. E. J. WOLF.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

Life-Work of Pastor Louis Harms. Of the "Luth. Hand-book Series." Translated from the German of Pastor Theodore Harms, his brother and successor, by Mary E. Ireland. With portrait. pp. 118. Cloth bound. Price 40 cents.

In a letter to his brother, Louis Harms said: "The only theory I value is the Holy Spirit " This reveals the secret of that wonderfully potent life. It was a life of earnest piety, great faith, and the utmost confidence in God. Pastor Harms was humble before God and zealous before man, full of ceaseless activity and self-sacrifice. The history of the Church does not present a more worthy example of true missionary spirit. The story of the Hermannsburg Mission-house and its lowly Lutheran pastor will never cease to prove an inspiration to the people of God. STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

Climbing Olivet. A Series of Talks to Applicants for Confirmation. By Rev. Edwin Heyl Delk.

These talks are for young people after a course in catechization, and are capitally adapted to their purpose. Sound in the truths set forth, clear in mode of expression, and winning the interest of the reader by the happy way in which the thought is put, this booklet is a gem. Well would it be for all—the more mature as well as the young—to give it a careful reading. P. M. BIKLE.

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1900.

ARTICLE I.

HIGHER CRITICISM.

By Rev. Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph. D.

Higher Criticism is an important and indispensable tool in the work-shop of the student of God's Word. The deserved ill repute in which it stands at present in conservative, theological and churchly circles is the natural and necessary outcome, not of its legitimate use, but of its abuse, consisting in the control of its methods and manners and results by certain philosophical principles that are inconsistent with the character and the contents of the Scriptures. The science has also been unfortunate in the name by which it has in recent years become known. "Higher Criticism"—really only a new name for an old discipline—is not so-called because, properly conducted, it is in possession of certain esoteric principles and processes for the discovery of truths and history in reference to the origin and growth of the biblical books and their historical back-ground not accessible to the ordinary Bible reader, but this term aims only to note the next higher step in the study of the Bible books following upon lower or textual criticism. Logically the latter must precede the former, and hence the two names, lower and higher criticism. For besides, lower criticism was the subject of sharp antagonism as is the case in reference to higher now. The tens of thousands of variants in the New Testament manuscripts, before their true lesson was learned, worried Bible students as much as the documentary theory of the Pentateuch

and other Old Testament books do now. Naturally the matter of the text must be settled first, and the original readings of the first writers restored, if necessary, before the literary and historical study, of which Higher Criticism really consists, can be thought of. In this inner relation of the two sides of the study of the biblical books lies the reason and the justification of the two appellations: "Lower" and "Higher Criticism." In reality, one is neither lower nor higher than the other. And in this connection it should not be forgotten that some of the objectionable features in the current criticism of the day are really attributable not to higher but to lower criticism. If, *e. g.*, the doxology of the Lord's Prayer is omitted; the pericope of the woman caught in adultery; the trinity passage in John, and the like, this is really in compliance with the demands of lower criticism. It has been found that in certain leading manuscripts such passages are not found, and accordingly the best textual criticism of the New Testament seems to demand their omission.

In fact, the name "Higher Criticism," is rarely if ever applied to the science under discussion by its friends and by those who carefully and cautiously make use of the discipline as the best interests of Bible research demands. It is rather a term of reproach applied by those who are opposed to the present type of biblical scholarship that operates chiefly in this department. The best term for the discipline doubtlessly would be "historical" or "literary" criticism, or still better "historico-literary criticism," as its principles and methods really combine both the historical and the inner critical study of a literary production. For, it should not be forgotten that this kind of study, employed for the purpose of determining the real contents and teachings of a book, is not confined to the Scriptures at all. Higher Criticism is in fact employed in the interpretation of any literary production, and must be, wherever thoroughness and exactness is to be allowed. If, *e. g.*, the student of Herodotus examines the writings of this historian in the light of what is known of the countries he describes and then tests them as to their degree of probability and their probable literary history, this process is nothing but Higher Criticism. If again, the reader of Cicero's

letters studies the times and the historical surroundings of these writings and also their style, their contents, etc., for the purpose of understanding their real lessons, this again is nothing but Higher Criticism. The legitimate and necessary evidence of such a discipline in the interests of exact research, both in the biblical and other departments, is practically self-evident. Nor is it denied by even the most determined opponents of the common and current biblical criticism of the times. Professor Green, of Princeton, was a higher critic in the real sense of the term just as much as is Professor Wellhausen, whose teachings he so strongly antagonized, but in the application of the science the former rejected far-reaching subjective principles, and methods that in the work of the latter are the all-controlling factors and forces. Indeed to Higher Criticism the Church has been indebted for some of its best work. When Luther and his friends, on the basis of historical and inner reasons, rejected the Old Testament Apocrypha as not a legitimate portion of God's Word and accordingly not binding on the conscience of the Christian, they simply acted as higher critics and the whole Protestant Church in accepting the conclusion of the Reformer have endorsed this act. Luther's doubts as to the character of James, the apocalypse of John, of Hebrews, are well known, and his right to study these books with this objeet in view none can deny, however we may be disinclined to share his hesitancy.

It is for this reason that as long as this discipline is kept within its legitimate bounds there need be no substantial disagreement as to its teachings and tenets. Merely as a literary and historical study-investigation of the biblical books there are no reasons why this agreement should not exist, as it may exist in the literary and historical study of Homer, Dante, or Shakespeare. Only then, when on the basis of such literary and historical study, a constructive or reconstructive scheme as to the religious process these books describe, is made, into which, *ab extra*, principles are introduced that have nothing to do with the critical study—only then does the great chasm appear that separates totally and entirely the believing from the unbelieving, the conservative from the radical critics. Nobody can object to the

newer criticism simply because it teaches a documentary theory in reference to the Pentateuch and claims that these books are a composite from various older writings. Such a view is perfectly consistent with the claims of these books to being the production of a Moses and having been revealed by Jehovah. We know now better than ever before, especially through the Tel-el-Amarna and other archaeological finds in Egypt and in the Tigris-Euphrates Valley, that long before the times of the Exodus literature and letters flourished throughout Western Asia, and that it would be surprising not that Moses did make use of older writings in the composition of the five books, as such earlier documents were confessedly used in Kings, Chronicles and other writings of the Old Testament, but the surprise would be, if he had *not* made use of such sources. In fact merely the literary substratum of the higher Criticism schemes in reference to the Old Testament need not be objectionable, unless it be from the standpoint of literary criticism. Theology has no special interests in maintaining a documentary or a non-documentary theory as such in reference to the books of Moses. But when the next step is taken, and on the basis of such a literary substratum a superstructure is erected, into the building material of which is introduced a mass and multitude of hay and stubble of human theory, figment and philosophy, then the earnest student of God's Word must rise and protest. And just at this point lies the great objectionable work of what is called Higher Criticism, but really is only sujective hypothesis construction. The whole modern biblical school in its radical and most representative elements is dominated by the philosophical idea of natural development. As the veteran Delitzsch said shortly before his death, the modern school aims to introduce into the Old Testament especially "the religion of the era of Darwin." In common with much of the teachings of that new but mischievous science Comparative Religion, a regular Pandora box of oddities and crudities, in religious thought, modern criticism sees in the Old Testament religious history a gradual development, not of divine revelation of the plan of salvation for lost men as the New Testament and the Church

have taught all along, but rather of the natural religious instincts of the Israelitish people, who possessed a natural aptitude of religion in the same way in which the Greeks were endowed for philosophical thought and the Romans for administrative work. In other words, the newer criticism practically aims at abolishing Jehovah from Israel's history as the special and controlling factor in this development. As Kuenen, one of the most open and consistent representatives of this school, openly teaches, the "religion of Israel is one of the greatest religions of the world, nothing less *but also nothing more.*" The unique element, the divine element as a special and characteristic feature, is thus naturally eliminated, or would be, if this principle were consistently carried out. The degree of radicalism displayed in the researches of a Bible critic of modern times depends on the extent to which this radical naturalistic or at least naturalizing principle is applied and enforced. That under its spell and influence all differences between inspired and uninspired books disappear, goes without saying. For this reason, it is only natural that Stade, in his characteristic "*Geschichte des Volkes Israel,*" regards the apocrypha and the apocalypses of the inter-Testament period as equally good and reliable sources for determining the religious history and status of the old covenant people as are the canonical books.

It is really this underlying philosophical principle of natural development that has determined the whole reconstructive scheme of modern biblical criticism in its radical, more radical and most radical phases. Accordingly the books and their contents found in the Old Testament are not the revelations of God through his appointed servants, but are rather the documentary evidence of the religious stages through which Israel's history had developed. The laws of the Pentateuch are accordingly not regarded as having been given for the purpose of instructing the people as to their religious duties, but are only the codification of the religious laws that had in the course of time been introduced by the people themselves. They existed in fact, before they existed in writing, and the historical process is thus simply inverted.

And what is the case in reference to the Pentateuch is also true of the rest of the Old Testament. Particularly is this true of the prophets. The second part of Isaiah, Chap. 40–66, are denied to the Isaiah of history and are attributed to a "great Unknown" prophet of the Exilic period, for the simple reason that the historical surroundings of Isaiah's period do not furnish the material for the natural explanation of the genesis and contents of the magnificent prophecies. It matters not if the New Testament, with Christ and the apostles at the head, takes a different view of the whole Old Testament religion and on particular problems with reference to authorship, date, etc., of certain books or portions, the newer criticism will acknowledge no such authority, and prefers to believe that even the Saviour was held by the popular prejudices of his times in reference to the sacred books of the Jews. This condition of affairs shows to what a wonderful degree the naturalistic principle has control of the newer critical school. It acknowledges not the authority of Christ or of his Apostles or of the New Testament, but only the authority of Darwin and his philosophy of natural development.

It is accordingly then the abuse and not the use of Higher Criticism, unfortunately so-called—that the Church and all true students of God's Word must antagonize. It would be worse than folly to oppose what element of truth may underlie the tenets of this critical school, the exaggeration and misrepresentation and misapplication, of what element of truth constitutes its stock in trade. In some respects the Church is under obligation to the modern criticism, especially in having emphasized as never before, the historical side of the Scriptures. The failure to do so was manifestly a weakness in the biblical studies of the Fathers, also of the Lutheran Church, and this failure has appeared especially in the inability to appreciate the prophecies and predictions of the Old Testament in their proper historical settings and in the inclination to make them mere *dicta probantia* without special historical cause or purpose. That the Scriptures are not only a revelation but also the history of a revelation is really a valuable acquirement of modern Bible research, and has contributed to the understanding of certain details of

biblical subjects to a noteworthy degree. The Pauline doctrine of justification by faith alone, and the predominantly negative shape in which it is put by the great apostle, directing it as he does against the dogma of justification by the merits of the law, becomes all the more plain at least in form if not materially, by understanding the historical background of the New Testament, especially the legalistic teachings of the official Jewish theology of the times when Paul was called upon to combat. It is again the abuse of this principle, current in itself, that constitutes the objectionable feature in its application in modern criticism. If these historical forces are made the sole or chief cause of the teachings of the New Testament, as is done to a greater or less degree by the critics, then again this religious development becomes a purely naturalistic process and the inspired character of the sacred books and of the religious development they portray is actually lost.

The cardinal sin of modern Higher Criticism consists then in this, that the literary and historical analysis of the biblical books is put entirely under the control of the philosophical idea of natural development, and that then these books, *nolens volens*, are made to teach a religious scheme that is absolutely contradictory to their own claims, to the teachings of Christ and the Apostles, to the very nature of this Christian religion and the convictions of the Church at large in all generations and ages.

And what is the present status of this criticism? The coolest and most deliberate judgment of observers must be that it has passed its zenith and is on the decline. Its spread has never been what it was supposed to be. In Germany, the breeding place and headquarters of all the newer phases of theological research, good and bad, it has practically been confined to the universities and to the circles under university influence. It has not found its way into the Church at large, to a noteworthy degree. Evidences of this fact abound. When several years ago Professor Harnack advocated the abolition of the Apostles' Creed from the liturgical and confessional use of the churches, Protestant Germany arose almost to a man against the innovation. In fact, the Church at large in the land of Luther is much

better than its reputation for orthodox and positive evangelical faith. As a rule, the pastors, when they enter upon their duties in the congregations, quietly discard the teachings of the university professors on the subject of the Scriptures, finding them inconsistent with their duties to the congregations. There actually exists a chasm between the theologies of the universities and those of the churches at large. The former do not fairly represent the latter, and there is constant antagonism between them. At Bonn, Marburg, Berlin, Tübingen and other universities, the demands of the conservative church factor have compelled the authorities to appoint conservative professors, especially in the biblical departments, to counteract the influence of the radicals and teach a theology that can be used on the pulpit as well as in the lecture hall. No one knows better than the university professors that their influence is lost to a notable degree in the pulpits and the pews, and for this reason they have in recent years inaugurated the scheme of "vacation lecture" courses, where pastors are invited to come and hear of the latest results of critical research. The plan can not be said to have been a success.

Nor has the popularizing of the newer criticism in other countries, notably England and America, led to a consistent adoption of its teachings and tenets by large masses. It is fair to believe that many ministers too, who think they have embraced the new wisdom, have really not done so, being unacquainted with what is logically and consistently involved. The newer criticism has not entranced the multitudes anywhere.

The universities, especially of Germany, are indeed under its spell and dominion; but not in its radical shape. There is indeed not a single theological professor in all of the twenty famous universities of the Fatherland, who will accept that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, even in its main elements, or that Isaiah wrote the second part of the book of Isaiah, or that Daniel wrote the book that bears his name, but it is equally true that not a few of the Old Testament men, and usually those who lecture to the largest number of students, do not accept the radical reconstructive scheme so popular in certain circles. On

purely literary subjects, even so far as the placing of the Levitical laws into the period of Ezra, there is a general agreement; but not on the naturalistic hypothesis of Israel's religious history. This prominent men like König of Bonn, von Orelli of Basel, Oettli of Kiel, Volck of Rostock and others emphatically reject. There is indeed not a single university professor in Germany, unless it be Nösgen, the New Testament man of Rostock, who accepts the literal inspiration of the Scriptures and believes these books to be without error or mistake; but between the moderate adherents of the literary phases of the Higher Criticism, and the adherents of the radical naturalism, there is really a difference not of degre but of kind. Between them there exists, as Delitzsch says, a "deep chasm."

But even in the matter of literature problems a determined effort is made to undermine the newer school. This has been done most successfully and thoroughly in the department of New Testament research by Professor Th. Zahn, of Erlangen, the prince of scholars in this line, in his magnificent and massive two volume work, entitled "Introduction to the New Testament," of which the second edition has already been called for. With a mastery of details never before seen, Zahn has here demolished the whole structure of destructive New Testament criticism, and vindicated throughout the Church's conviction concerning the New Testament writings. For fully two decades this conservative reaction has been in progress in the New Testament sphere and has reached its acme in Zahn's work. In the Old Testament things are not yet in so favorable a condition, but it does not require a prophet or a prophet's son to foretell that an equally successful reaction has been inaugurated and will be completed. A number of names of prominence appear already, but none as great as that of Zahn. Professor Green's work in this direction is much appreciated also in Germany where the main defenders of the old landmarks have been Pastor Rupprecht and Pastor Ad. Zahn, recently deceased, of Stuttgart. The former in his three volume work, "Der Rätsel's Lösung," has furnished the best argument advanced against the

literary substratum of the whole critical school, and his *Einleitung* to the New Testament is good as far as it goes, but is not exhaustive. Other men like Strack, Naumann, *et al.*, could also be mentioned here, going to show that the newer criticism in Germany is meeting with considerable opposition in Germany too. But as yet much preparatory and special work on detail problems remains to be done, before a general and crushing work can be prepared like that of Zahn on the New Testament. One of the most significant signs in this direction is the fact that the underlying principle of the newer school, namely, the subjective at the expense of the traditional is gradually losing advocates. Harnack acknowledges that renewed emphasis must be placed on the traditional information at the disposal of scholars with reference to the Scriptures and the early history of the Church, and now declares that the development of forty years after the death of Christ would be sufficient to explain the whole historical development and literature of the New Testament. This is a determined attack on the subjectivism so characteristic and potent in modern biblical scholarship, which has been overriding all principles, reasons or considerations. If subjective methods and manners are no longer made the measure of all things, much will have been gained for a better kind and a fairer method of biblical investigation.

It thus appears that the subjective and naturalistic spirit of modern radical biblical study has been responsible for the untold evils that practically undermine the divine character of the Scriptures and their contents as a revelation; and that a sober second thought is making itself felt, which in part has led and in other respects promises still further to lead back theological research to better foundations and safer moorings. That these radical and rationalistic researches have been without benefit or profit, it would be foolish to assert. In fact they have done good. The New Testament books never were so entrenched in historical truth as they are now, had they not been so bitterly attacked by Baur and the Tübingen school. When the fiery ordeal of the Wellhausen furnace is a thing of the past, the Old Testament will appear better than ever before as the word of the liv-

ing God. The Church has passed through such periods before, as witnesses the time of vulgar rationalism, and every time both the Church and the Scriptures have profited by the process. Magna est veritas et praevalebit.

ARTICLE II.

LUTHER AND THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

By Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D.

[concluded from vol. xxx., p. 399.]

LUTHER'S REMONSTRANCES.

Copies of the Articles of Concord proposed by the two halves of the Committee of Fourteen were promptly sent to Luther by the Elector of Saxony with the request that he render an opinion on them.* Melanchthon also wrote to Luther, August 22nd, and gave him the chief points in the negotiations.† Luther replied, August 26th. His letter to the Elector is a masterful *exposé* of the poison, deceit and danger that lie concealed in the Articles. As it shows how clearly Luther comprehended the situation at Augsburg, and how firmly he maintained his position against the chief corruptions of the Roman Catholic Church, we give it in full:

"Grace and Peace in Christ. Illustrious, High-born Prince, Most Gracious Elector and Lord:

"I have received your letter together with copies from both parts of the Committee. Now inasmuch as Your Grace desires my opinion on the same, I will herewith obediently render it.

"The conditions and methods proposed by them and accepted by ours are by no means to be tolerated; and I am supremely astonished that such things should have been proposed. As regards the Articles from our side, this is my judgment: When our opponents desire us to teach that one form of the Sacrament is right, and that it shall not be enjoined but left free to

*Coelestin, III., 52a. †C. R., II., 299.

use one or both forms, Your Grace knows very well that it is our chief contention that nothing must be taught, or done, that is not clearly in accord with God's word; lest, as Paul says, we run in vain and beat the air. We have trouble enough even when we go according to and abide by the sure word. It is certain that the doctrine about one form of the Sacrament is a pure human invention, and is not at all supported by the word of God. But on the contrary the use of both forms is established by the clear words of God. Hence we cannot either approve or teach that the use of one form is right. For there stands Christ, Matt. 15 : 9: *Ye serve me with the doctrines of men.*

"Besides, in using only one form we treat the words of Christ with indifference, where he so heartily and earnestly enjoins: *Do this in remembrance of me.* Even they themselves do not believe that it is a matter of indifference. For on account of this they have burned, hounded and persecuted many, and have condemned it as a great heresy. Hence not only on God's account, and our own, but for their sake, we must not allow that it is a matter of indifference. We must regard them as murderers and scoundrels, since, forsooth, they have persecuted and condemned an indifferent thing as a heresy. They themselves do not believe that it is a matter of indifference. Much less can we so teach. Let them recall and bring back all they have persecuted for this cause. It is a very fine complaint they make, viz., that they cannot hold the people where we do not preach that they are right. I am delighted to hear such a wise reason. It is as though God must allow his word to be preached in order that they may hold their people and remain tyrants.

"Of Private Masses I say the same: They are the invention of men, are without support from God's word, and are an abuse. Our opponents do not strive to compel us to restore these, but only not to forbid them. We do not prevent such, but we cannot approve them. If one human invention be admitted, then another must be admitted. That is the way it goes. If we allow the Private Masses, then forthwith we must drop the Gospel and accept a human invention; for there is no reason why one,

and not all human inventions, should be received. To forbid and condemn all is to forbid and condemn one.

"They pretend that it is not the function of rulers to prevent such things. They know very well that the office of ruling and the office of the ministry are not one and the same, and that Princes have nothing to do with such things. But the question is whether a Prince as a Christian will approve this, and not whether he acts as a Prince. Whether a Prince should preach, and whether he should approve preaching, are different matters. It is not the Prince, but the Scripture, that disapproves of Private Masses. It is in the power of the Prince to say whether he will allow the Scriptures or not. No man on earth can force him to do it.

"Should the Canon be allowed with a proper interpretation? Yes, provided it be placed in the hands of safe expounders. Long ago I might have undertaken to explain the religion of the Turks, and to reduce all kinds of unbelief to the Christian faith. It is well known that they have sold the Masses as a sacrifice and a work. Now they would explain them. In a word it is a human invention, such as cannot be tolerated in the affairs of God. Besides, it is dangerous and vexatious. And since they do not abstain from Private Masses, and do not agree with us in regard to the Mass, viz., that it is not a sacrifice, why do they wish to retain the offensive word, seeing that it is unnecessary and dangerous? We should not unnecessarily expose ourselves to danger, for this is forbidden, and it is to tempt God St. Augustine says: *Maintain the doctrine, but correct the language.* Speaking of fate he says, he that understands fate as the decree of God, understands it aright. Yet he will not tolerate the word, but says: *Correct the language.* Shall we adopt an obscure and uncertain word when we find it hard to maintain those that are clear and plain?

"And what advantage is there in retaining the word *sacrifice* in the Canon? The Canon so plainly declares the Mass to be a true sacrifice, that no man can explain or understand it otherwise. For it is stated that God by the hand of his angel will have such a sacrifice of the Mass brought up before the holy

altar. This cannot be explained as meaning a memorial of the sufferings of Christ, for this must be done by preaching. In a word, in the Canon the prayer is made that God will accept this sacrifice, since it is the body and blood of his dear Son, as though a man must intercede for Christ with God. That is blasphemous and infamous: Hence the Canon is not to be tolerated.

"Finally. We will suffer everything and make concessions so far as that is in our power. But we pray that they will not demand of us what is not in our power. But it is not in our power to accept anything contrary to God's word; and it is not in our power to accept a form of worship that is contrary to God's word. Fasts and festivals instituted by men we can accept in so far as they have been established by the civil government as a civil ordinance; for all such things belong to the secular power, which is adorned with ceremonies, robes, gestures, fasts and festivals. Such things God subordinated to reason, and has enjoined that they be treated as optional matters. Gen. 2. They are earthly things, and their nature is earthly, and they are all subordinated to reason, as Paul said: *Rule over the earth.* Now inasmuch as the civil government is the highest work of reason, it can act and command in these matters.

"Such is my answer given in haste to Your Princely Grace's inquiries. I commend Your Princely Grace to the favor of God. Friday after Bartholomew (August 26th), anno 1530.

"Obediently,

MARTIN LUTHER, D."*

On the same day Luther wrote to Spalatin as follows: "I am sorry to learn that you have begun a marvelous work, namely, the reconciliation of the Pope and Luther. But the Pope refuses, and Luther begs to be excused. Take care lest your labor be in vain. If you succeed against the will of both of us, then I will follow your example and will reconcile Christ and Beliel."†

He also wrote to Melanchthon the same day: "Grace and

*De Wette, IV., 140–3.
†De Wette, IV., 144.

Peace in Christ. If the matter was to end in this way, My Philip, I am astonished that they could tolerate that Committee, and could try to treat of the matter in a friendly way. Is there not indeed guile and treachery there? You now have to do with Cochleus, with the Archbishop of Saltzburg and with those ghostly monks who were rowed across the Rhine at Spires.* What is there that I have ever less hoped for, less desired, than to negotiate for agreement in doctrine? It would be like driving out the Pope, or as though our doctrine and the papacy could be conserved together. There is the semblance of a treaty, and of an alliance, in order that the Pope may remain. He is willing to concede and to permit, provided we obey. But thanks to God, you have not accepted these things.

"You write that you forced Eck to confess that we are justified by faith. Would that you had forced him not to lie. Eck, forsooth, confesses that there is the righteousness of faith. But meanwhile the papacy defends every kind of abomination, kills, persecutes, and condemns those who profess the doctrine of faith; and instead of repenting, it goes on. The same is done by the entire party of the adversaries. Seek for terms of concord with these people (si Christo placet), and toil in vain until they get a chance to destroy us.

"What you write about both species is correct. I agree with you that it is not a matter of indifference, but a command to take both species if we wish to take the Sacrament. In the Church of God and in the worship of God we cannot arbitrarily either institute or tolerate what cannot be defended by the word of God, and I am not a little annoyed by this sacrilegious word indifferent; for by this word I might easily render all the laws and institutions of God indifferent. Admit one thing in the word of God to be indifferent, how will you hinder everything from becoming indifferent? They cry and vociferate that we condemn the entire Church. We say that the Church has been led captive, and has been oppressed by the tyranny of one species, and hence is to be excused, just as the entire synagogue

*See *Historia de Spectris Spirensibus*, Schirrmacher, 194–6.

in Babylon was excused, because it could not observe the law of Moses in ecclesiastical rites and in its sacraments, as it could in Jerusalem. Nor did they cease to be the people of God, because, as captives and forbidden, they did not observe the rites enjoined upon them. But Eck wants himself and his to be proclaimed the Church. We on the contrary say that we do not condemn the entire Church, but that in mutilating the sacrament they condemn the entire word of God (which is more than the Church).

"As touching the rendering of obedience to the Bishops, and as touching jurisdiction and common ceremonies, as you write, see that you do not yield more than you have yielded, lest in defending the gospel we be forced to a more difficult and dangerous war. I know you have always made an exception of the gospel in these agreements. But I fear that hereafter they will charge that we are perfidious and fickle if we do not do as they wish. They will accept our concessions *large*, *largius*, *largissime*, and will make their own *stricte*, *strictius*, *strictissime*.

"In a word, I am out-and-out displeased with the *tractatus de doctrinae concordia*, since such is plainly impossible, unless the Pope is willing to put away his popery. Was it not enough that we gave an account of our faith, and seek peace? Why should we hope to convert them to the truth? We came for the purpose of hearing whether or not they would approve our position, but willing to allow them to remain what they are. We inquire, Will they condemn or will they justify? If they condemn, what profit is there in wishing to try to have agreement with enemies? If they justify what need is there to want to retain the old abuses? But since it is certain that we are condemned by them, and that they do not repent, but try to retain their own affairs, why do we not understand that all that they attempt is deceit and lies? For you cannot say that their affairs proceed from the Holy Spirit, since such things are destitute of repentance, of faith, of piety. But the Lord who began this work in us will perfect it. To him I heartily commend you. August 26th, 1530. MARTIN LUTHER."*

*De Wette, IV., 145.

He wrote also the same day to Justus Jonas: "Grace and Peace. I have seen and read the decisions of yours as touching our cause. What I wrote to Philip, that I write you, namely, that in fealty to Christ, and for my sake, as I am a Christian, you and all ours believe that Campeggius is one big notorious devil. Words cannot express how vehemently I am excited about those terms proposed by the other party, so that the demons are ridiculing and mocking our cross. This is the trick of Campeggius and the Pope, first to try our cause by violence and threats, and if this does not succeed, then to assail it with deceit and treachery. You have experienced violence and threats, and you bore the terrible advent of the Emperor. Now you are bearing treachery and those ghostly monks that were rowed across the Rhine at Spires. That is, they are proposing harmony in doctrine. This is a mystery indeed. What but violence and deceit could you expect from the father of deceit and lies, the author of death and violence? But he who gave you power to overcome violence, will give grace and strength to overcome deceit. Of these things I have written to the Prince and to Philip. The messenger must return in haste. Quit ye like men. Don't trust the adversaries, except they prove their position by plain Scripture. The Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen. From the Hermitate. August 26th, 1530.

MARTIN LUTHER." *

In these letters Luther employs argument, irony and denunciation in order to express his opposition to the Articles proposed for the reunion of the Protestants with the Catholics. He simply will not tolerate such Articles. They are in conflict with the fundamental principles of the gospel. It is Luther *versus* the Pope; it is the word of God *versus* the institutions of men; it is Christ *versus* Beliel. There could be no reconciliation along such lines. The point of contact was wanting. And as evidence of Luther's abiding and growing opposition to the Articles of agreement, we have his letters of August 28th to Spalatin, Melanchthon and Jonas, in which he warns,

*De Wette, IV., 147–8.

in the strongest language, against the wiles of the enemy and against the making of further concessions.* About this time also he wrote an "Opinion,"† in which he instructs his colleagues at Augsburg about concessions to the enemy. As touching the doctrinal articles of the Confession nothing is to be yielded, inasmuch as such Articles are founded on Holy Scripture, and have not been refuted by the adversaries. He then takes up the various subjects contained in the Articles on Abuses.

In the matter of both species in the Eucharist, he declares that nothing can be conceded, since no man can change an institution of God, neither "can we teach in our churches that those do not sin, nor act contrary to the command of God, who either administer or receive only one species." "The marriage of priests we neither can nor ought to prohibit, since it was instituted, appointed and confirmed by God." "We cannot allow Private Mass to be restored or celebrated in our churches, since everybody knows that it is an idolatry and an abuse." "We distinctly declare that we cannot receive and approve either the Small or the Large Canon, since in express terms they make of the Mass a work by which grace and the remission of sins are bestowed *ex opere operato* upon the priest and upon the lay worshipper." He is willing that the cloister-people shall remain in the cloisters and have food and shelter, but their Masses and their ungodly manner of life shall not be tolerated. He thinks the episcopal jurisdiction might be allowed, provided the Bishops will not seek to persecute and to exterminate the Lutheran doctrine. Meats and festivals can not be allowed to burden the conscience.

The "Opinion," of which we have presented only the salient features, is a trenchant criticism of the concessions made by the Protestants in the Committee of Fourteen. It shows that its author is out-and-out opposed to making any more concessions than had been made already in the Confession; and his reasons for rejecting the Abuses are even stronger and clearer than those given in the Confession itself. Luther, who had taken no part

*De Wette, IV., 155–8. †*Erl. Ausg.*, 65 : 46 *et seqq.*

in the preparation of the Confession after April 22nd, and had in the earlier days of the Diet been little more than an interested on-looker, has now stepped to the front, and has assumed command of the Protestant forces at Augsburg. This is further shown by the letter which he wrote to Lazarus Spengler of Nurenberg who had complained to Luther about the concessions made at Augsburg: "I have commended the cause to God, and have it so well in hand that no man will force me to yield anything; nor can I be deserted so long as Christ and I are one. For though too much has been conceded (for this I was not prepared), yet the cause is not lost, but a new conflict has been begun, in which our opponents will be convinced that they have acted dishonorably. For besides and beyond the gospel nothing can be conceded, no matter which party holds the field by guile." *

REMONSTRANCE OF THE NURENBERGERS.

August 23rd the Nurenberg legates, Kress and Baumgartner, sent a copy of the Articles of Agreement to their senate.† Immediately was this laid before the city council and the theologians, and on the 26th a "*Judicium et Censura*" was returned with instructions that it be laid before the Elector of Saxony and the Margrave of Brandenburg.‡ In the letter of instructions the Nurenbergers express their displeasure that so much had been done behind their backs and behind the backs of other allies of the Protestant cause. They dread the displeasure of the Princes, but they must be true to God, to their own consciences and to their own souls. They say that they can by no means approve the concessions that have been made. The "*Judicium et Censura*" is as follows:

"The Senate of Nurenberg has, so far as the shortness of the time would permit, carefully read and considered the document lately put forth at Augsburg by committees appointed by the papal party, and has had the same considered by its theologians. We find that the document contains three classes of articles.

*De Wette, IV., 158. †C. R., II., 301.

‡The letter is printed in *Mitteilungen des Vereins fuer Geschichte der Stadt Nurenberg*, *Viertes Heft*, p. 36.

"First, those on which the Committee agreed, and which have not hitherto been the subject of controversy. These we now pass by.

"Secondly, those articles which have been hitherto the subjects of controversy, and have not yet been agreed upon. In regard to these it is right, Christian and proper that those things should be firmly maintained which ours have publicly preached and which they have set forth in the Confession as true and Christian.

"Thirdly, those articles which in part are matters of doubt, and in part subjects of controversy.

"In regard to the controverted articles, or as quite recently they have been called, the doubtful articles, the Senate and its theologians, and beyond a doubt other Christian people, are of the opinion that in that document much has been yielded, granted and conceded to the Papists, which either wounds the conscience, and cannot be sustained by Scripture, or which will bring evil and scandal upon those who have hitherto preferred Christ and his gospel. Some of these articles and their objectionable features we will briefly indicate:

"First. It would be not a little inconvenient for pious rulers to obligate themselves, and to agree, to allow the monks, nuns, and cloisters to remain in their pristive condition, and to use the ceremonies that have been in vogue among them. For in many places it would follow that the old *Patrocinia*, preaching, impious masses, fraternities, funeral rites, and many like things would be restored in the cloisters, and would allure and seduce innocent people. And by the diversity of ceremonies such confusion would be introduced, that among the common people, especially in large communities, nothing but constant sedition could be expected, to say nothing about the things arising from the same source, that would be silently tolerated.

"Secondly. It is not well, and it will in no small degree promote error, to concede to the Papists, as they have hitherto taught, that there are three parts in repentence. For there is no doubt that by confession, the Papists mean auricular confession (Ohrenbeicht), and by satisfaction, the satisfaction of works.

Now let every one consider, if these two parts be conceded to them as necessary parts of repentence, how much they would thereby gain; and let every one consider whether the word of God and the Holy Scripture can allow this. Or should the matter be glossed, and explained differently from what the Papists understand it, yet it will never be understood by the common people otherwise than according to the papal sense.

"Thirdly. If the communion is to be administered to no one who has not previously made oral confession, then the way will be opened for scruples and errors. But it would be perilous to bind the communion absolutely to confession, and to bind the people to confession. What would this be except to bind the conscience again to oral confession, to which no one should be again bound by compulsion or necessity? This would also be to restore the papal torments, and it would force the people on the day of communion and at some particular time to confess at the whim of the pastors.

"Fourthly. The article about fasts, the eating and the abstaining from flesh, is perfectly ridiculous and detrimental. For thus the people would be forced against their will again to observe quadragesimal and other festival days. Thus Christian liberty, under the guise of maintaining peace and unity, would be destroyed. Christian liberty as likewise every other article of faith, we ought to maintain, as Paul commands. Abandon Christian liberty, and institute necessity, and the Papists will have it all their own way.

"Fifthly. There is no Scripture to be found anywhere that teaches, or that allows us to infer, that deceased saints, or the angels in heaven, pray to God for us. Also there is no mediator, intercessor, or high priest before God, as all Scripture shows, except Christ alone. What use is there then, what advantage do we have, from conceding and yielding this article to the Papists, which they have tried to base on the Scriptures, but of which the Scriptures have not a trace? And every intelligent person knows well what abuses have followed gradually from this article.

"Sixthly. In this a larger jurisdiction has been granted and conceded to the Bishops than they themselves have hitherto ever demanded, or have ever had. Should this article be established, then no more subtle and direct way of utterly wiping out the gospel in a short time, could be thought of. For if, as heretofore, the Bishops should have full power over the priests; if the Bishops by virtue of their episcopal authority are to be able unhindered to punish delinquent priests; if the pastors and priests are to be presented to the Bishops, as this article unqualifiedly proposes without any limitation of the episcopal power, what else will follow, or what is to be expected, except that the Bishops will never permit a truly Christian pastor to be presented? Or should they allow such a one to be presented, they will be forever making charges against him, or will be otherwise interfering with him, so that he cannot remain. Or what pastor would expose himself to such perils, or would preach, if there be no appeal to the rulers for protection against the Bishops, and if he had nothing but death and ruin to expect? How could the rulers answer before God and their own consciences for their subjects? But if the preachers should be thus harassed, arrested, persecuted, expelled, how long would the Gospel and the Christian religion remain? And how could the Papists offer a more subtle contrivance to the Christian Estates for deferring the articles about which there is dispute to a future council, than by having them accept this article of the Jurisdiction of the Bishops? For in this way they have hit upon a method and plan by which they can quickly overthrow the Gospel together with the preachers and pastors, so that it can never again be defended according to law and reason, against the Emperor, the Empire and the allied Estates.

"Finally. Such are the difficulties and objectionable features arising from several articles and from several passages in the document submitted. Should this document be accepted, consciences will be wounded, and a large part of the papal abuses will be confirmed, the Gospel will be held in contempt, the Evangelical Estates will be regarded as apostates, the Scriptures

will be neglected, things will be done contrary to the Scriptures in many ways, and one evil will beget another." *

With additional words and arguments the Senate remonstrates and warns against the concessions that have been made, and further points out the evil consequences that must result from a reunion on such a basis. In a word, the *Judicium et Censura* is a clear and pronounced condemnation of the Articles of Agreement made by the Joint Committee. The evangelical consciousness of the Nurenbergers has been fairly outraged.

OTHER REMONSTRANCES.†

1. Dr. Geryon Seiler, of Augsburg, an ardent friend of the Reformation, hearing of the concessions that had been made by the Protestant Committee, wrote a most earnest and trenchant letter to Spalatin, about August 20th or 21st. We can give only its salient points:

(a). In the proscription of marriage to the priests "the Evangelicals have not considered the interest of Christ and his kingdom, but their own interest."

(b). If the communion is to be received under one species only, "why has it been so bitterly contended that communion under one species is contrary to the Gospel?" "If for the sake of peace one species is to be conceded, then for the sake of peace, neither species ought to be taken."

(c). "Though the Mass is a memorial sacrifice, yet the Canon would have to be tolerated, and the words oblation, host, sacrifice, would have to be understood not as of a memorial." He insists on the removal of the Canon of the Mass, because it introduces a mode of worship that is contrary to the word of God. "Would not all Lutherans and Evangelicals cry out that those things have now been brought to ruin that hitherto were preached by their leaders? Such union would be like drawing a cloud over the sun. You say this must be endured for the sake of peace. Paul did not so love peace as to circumcise both Titus

*German in Chytraeus (1577), p. 173 *et seqq*, Latin in Coelestin III., 81 *et seqq*. Chytraeus, 297 *et seqq*.

†See Schmidt's *Philipp Melanchthon*, p. 231 *et seqq*.

and Timothy. He circumcised the one out of deference to the weak, but he refused to circumcise the other when he saw that it would bring prejudice to the faith. But the Papists are not weak. Rather are they blind. Hence they are to be let go. But if concord should be effected on these conditions, not peace, but the greatest commotion and many perils would follow."

By such and similar arguments Dr. Seiler opposes the course taken by the Lutherans, and insists that "such remedies will not heal the disease, but will make it worse."*

2. Lazarus Spengler, Secretary to the Nurenberg Senate, was one of the noblest spirits of the age, a thorough Protestant, and one of Luther's most devoted friends. On or about August 26th he wrote a letter to Augsburg that is full of warning and of expressions of dissatisfaction with the concessions made by the Protestant portion of the Committee of Fourteen. He does not propose to judge the Articles from the standpoint of the theologian; but he declares that he "cannot regard them as harmless, as safe for the conscience, and without injury to the glory of God." It is especially offensive to him to hear it said in the matter of the Private Masses, "We cannot help it." He answers thus: "There is a difference between not being able to help a thing, and approving it. If it be beyond my power to prevent a thing that I regard as wrong, and it come to pass, then before God and my conscience I am innocent. But if I approve a thing that is wrong, which, as one in authority I might hinder or prevent, or not allow, with what kind of conscience can I answer before God, before my subjects and before the whole world?" He was most indignant that in such grave matters neither Luther nor the allies of the Evangelical cause had been consulted. He says: "Everyone must confess that Dr. Martin Luther is the one through whom, as his instrument, God Almighty has preached and published his word in Germany, and that up to this time he has been the leader and standard-bearer in this valiant transaction. Now, in my opinion, it is wholly improper to allow him, the originator and leader in these matters, the most learned and experienced theologian in Germany,

*Förstemann, II., 286 *et seqq.*

to be ignored, and that these articles should not be submitted to him before they are delivered and approved. Are we to suppose that Luther is so puerile and cowardly, that, should anything injurious and offensive be decided on behind his back, he would sit still and say nothing, and affect that what we had resolved on pleased him?" * * * "I fear this: Because we regard the Princes at Augsburg as our champions in matters of faith, and have looked up to them and have entrusted so much to them, God may in this way show us what it is to trust more to men than to him. I do not suspect Philip Melanchthon of having done anything that is impious and unchristian; because I have hitherto regarded, and still regard, him as a wise, learned, pious and honorable man. Neither shall this transaction cause me to suspect him of having done anything so entirely reprehensible. For I consider that he is too pious knowingly to approve a thing that is against his conscience and contrary to the Gospel. But consider that Melanchthon has not had the experience of Luther. He has not yet been violently attacked as Luther has been. He is too unsophisticated for those cunning, unscrupulous court-knaves. He has also not yet learned the devil as is necessary in dealing with such people. It may be that in cases where the fundamentals are preserved, his love of temporal peace would lead him to yield and to consent, where Luther, or another, would do otherwise."*

3. The Lüneburgers, the Hessians and the legates of the Evangelical cities were violently hostile to the concessions that had been made by the Protestants, and especially were they displeased with the agreement to restore the full authority of the Bishops. We do not, indeed, have any written protest or remonstrance from the parties named above, but we have contemporaneous accounts that report their "great displeasure," and the earnest contentions they had with the Saxons, and their expressed unwillingness that anything more should be conceded.†

*Pressel's *Lazarus Spengler*, p. 72.

†See letter of Bernhard Besserer of Ulm in Kolde's *Analecta Lutherana* p. 148; C. R., II., 313; Schirrmacher, p. 242–2; Coelestin, III., 58b.

Melanchthon himself tells us that one of the Nurenberg legates, Baumgartner, had written him, that had he (Melanchthon) been hired by the Roman Pope, he could not have undertaken a better method of reinstating the papal domination than that which had been proposed.* John Brentz reports that the populace actually charged that the Lutheran portion of the Committee had been corrupted by papal gold.†

The whole situation is thus described by Hieronimus Baumgartner, of Nurenberg, in a private letter to Lazarus Spengler: "Dear Mr. Secretary: I cannot refrain from informing you confidentially how I regard the transactions of the Diet, in so far as they have reference to the faith.

"First. You know from what has transpired how our party has been already solicited and urged, now by one devil and now by another, who clothe themselves in pleasing form, yea, at times appear and act as angels of light. The opposite party has not indeed accomplished its purpose, and the proposals made by ours have not been publicly accepted, yet we find that the present intention is to report these proposals in the Recess as approved. And although this has not yet occurred, yet they do nothing in vain, but are always wringing some concessions from us. These concessions they hold on to, and will use them when our distress is the greatest. But God by special grace has appointed that the Confession has been delivered; otherwise our theologians would make a very different confession, as they would gladly do, if we would follow them, though they do not agree with each other. Philip has become more childish than a child, Brentz is not only destitute of tact, but is course and rude. Heller is full of fear. These three have misled the pious Margrave, and made him pusillanimous. They persuade him to do what they wish, though I observe that he wants to do right. The pious Vogler must have it said of him in his absence: If he were yet here so much that is good and pacific could not have been accomplished. In these negotiations the Elector has no one more sagacious than Dr. Brück. But he has been so far influenced that now

*C. R., II., 336. †C. R., II., 338.

even he acts with hesitation, (mit Sorgen), because he has no one to stand by him. For the other Saxon theologians dare not say a word publicly against Philip, or he is aroused, and replies, as lately he did to the Chancellor of Lüneburg: If anybody dares to say that the proposals made are not Christian, he lies like a villian. Whereupon he was answered: If anybody says the contrary, etc. Besides, those who act in a courageous and Christian manner are unceasingly slandered in every way, as we were witnesses to in the case of the Hessians, who in these matters have conducted themselves most uprightly and honorably.

"In a word. So soon as we reject some harsh and ungracious decision of the Emperor, they try so to entangle us as to have us give up the favor of God without getting that of the Emperor. It has continued to be the case that whenever the Princes are together, some one comes to the Elector and tells him what he honestly and sincerely thinks of matters, etc., and says that if some concession be made in this or in that part, etc., matters can yet be mended. Then comes Philip with his articles and explanations. Meanwhile these are reported to the Margrave by Heller and Brentz. If we refuse the broth they have concocted, their theologians run round and say that we will not allow peace (as though peace could be made by our concessions), and wish to act in concert with the Landgrave, whom they have outrageously slandered." *

There can be no doubt that this picture is painted in striking colors and is somewhat overdrawn; but that in its main features it is true to the life, is made sufficiently evident by numerous letters and reports written by other hands. Baumgartner, who was one of the Nurenberg legates, was too intelligent a man not to be able to comprehend the situation, and too honorable to wish to misrepresent it, though the intensity of his conviction may have led him into slight hyperbole. The situation was a distressing one. It cannot be denied that the feet of the Saxons and the Margravians had almost slipped back into the ways of Rome. Neither can it be denied that it is due preëminently to

*C. R., II., 363-4.

the Nurenberg, Lüneburg, and Hessian laymen that the reactionary movement set in, which, in its consummation, saved the day at Augsburg. For those laymen, as official and private documents demonstrate, not only resisted the making of further concessions, but criticised and condemned those that had been made in the Committee of Fourteen. Even Melanchthon himself has conceded as much. In a letter to Luther written September 4th, he says: "Our allies are manifestly playing the Elbe. Hence I am strengthened in the conviction that we ought to make peace. The Nurenberg legates and the Hessians do not keep within bounds, and the Lüneburgers agree with them. Ours think that no opportunity of making peace, provided it can be honorably made, ought to be lost." *

THE COMMITTEE OF SIX.

The Committee of Fourteen failed, as has been shown, to reach an ultimate basis of agreement. Only two or three matters, and those appertaining to ceremonies, and not to doctrines, separated its members. The Catholic Middle Party was encouraged rather than discouraged with the result. They thought that the difficulty lay in persons, and not in the subjects at issue. Duke George especially was regarded as the stumbling-block.† Hence it was resolved by the Catholics to eliminate him from the Committee. But in order to do this diplomatically, some of the Catholic Princes importuned the Elector of Saxony to agree to the appointment of a Committee of three on a side further to consider the points at issue. But such a proposition did not commend itself to some of the Protestants. They looked upon it as "vexatious and knavish," and discussed the matter in three separate meetings. Finally they agreed to it, but with the distinct understanding that nothing more was to be conceded to the Catholics.‡ On the side of the Catholics Bernhard Hagen Chancellor of the Elector of Cologne, Hieronimus

*C. R., II., 350. †Förstemann, II., 290; Schirrmacher, 242.

‡Cochlaeus, *Historia Martini Lutheri*, 406-7; C. R., II., 312; Schirrmacher, p. 242; Spalatin, *Annales*, 189; Sleidan's *History* (Eng. Trans.), p. 132.

Vehus Chancellor of Baden, and Dr. John Eck; and on the side of the Protestants, Dr. Gregory Brück Chancellor of the Elector of Saxony, Dr. Sebastian Heller Chancellor of Margrave George of Brandenburg, and Philip Melanchthon, were appointed.*

The Protestant Three were instructed to confine themselves to the discussion of five points: The Mass, Communion under both Kinds, the Marriage of the Priests, Monastic Vows, Episcopal Power; and to make no additional concessions, and to ascertain whether the opposite party would make additional concessions.†

August 24th the Joint Committee of Six met in the *Rathhaus*. Immediately the Catholics insisted on Communion in one kind on the Mass with the traditional ceremonies, and with both Canons, on priestly celibacy, on the support of the cloisters with the wonted service and dress, and on episcopal government of the churches. The Lutheran Three are clearly on the alert, and place themselves more in an attitude of defense than they had done in the Committee of Fourteen. The severe but merited condemnation of their former course, and the conditions that had attended their second appointment, had not only tied their hands, but had evidently quickened their Protestant consciousness. Hence they reply to the proposals of the Catholics in a somewhat decided tone: They cannot permit communion under one kind except in cases of necessity; they cannot tolerate Private Masses, since such masses are regarded as an *opus operatum*, and as a sacrifice for the living and for the dead; they reject the celibacy of the clergy, because it is a human invention, and marriage is an order of God; they will abide by what was agreed to in the Committee of Fourteen; they are willing to refer the matter of Episcopal government and church ceremonies to a free general council.‡

Two days later, Friday, August 26th, the Joint Committee

*Müller, *Historie*, p. 801; C. R., II., 312; Förstemann, II., 290–1; Coelestin, III., 60.

†*Strassburg Politis. Corresp.*, p. 487.

‡The Proposals of the Catholics, and the Reply of the Lutherans, are given by Müller, *Historie*, pp. 801 *et seqq.*, taken from Chancellor Brück's *Geschichte*.

met again. But nothing new was proposed by the Catholics. The Catholics refused to remove any of the manifest abuses, since they held that "their usages were right and must abide." The Lutherans refused to concur in what had been proposed, "but declared that should other Christian proposals be made, such as would bring no burden upon their consciences, another interview would not be declined."* In subsequent negotiations the Catholics reported that since agreement could not be effected, the Emperor was disposed to order a council, but under the condition that all innovations, both in doctrine and in church usages, should be discontinued among the Protestants, "and thus the common Church should be restored."†

The Lutherans reply that inasmuch as through the carelessness and neglect of the Bishops, false and seductive doctrines and usages have been introduced into the churches, as was shown in the Articles of the Confession, the Princes felt bound before God and their own consciences to make a Christian reformation as justified by the Scriptures and by the laws of the Pope himself. It was in accordance with precedent that in matters of faith a reformation should be introduced. They promise that they will lay the new proposals of the Catholics before their Principals.‡ This they did, and on Sunday, August 28th, an answer, both verbal and in writing, was rendered. The answer is a state-paper rather than a theological argument. It reviews the circumstances that attended the appointment and negotiations of the Committee of Fourteen. It then states that the Lutherans had done all in their power to make peace, and had conceded everything that could be conceded with a good conscience and with a proper regard for the honor of God; they had steadily appealed to a general council; that the Elector and other Orders, notwithstanding the opposition of some of their allies, have consented to the appointment of the Smaller Committee; that the Elector and Princes are not willing to proceed further, nor will they accede to the terms proposed by the

*Müller, p. 817; Förstemann, II., 301.
†Müller, 819.
‡Müller, p. 820.

Smaller Catholic Committee, since this is not more favorably inclined to peace than was the Larger Committee. But should more suitable terms be proposed for composing the difficulties, and for establishing peace, the Lutherans are ready to respond. The Catholics know the causes of the Abuses, and the sources of the doctrines contained in the Confession; the only cure for the Abuses in the Church is a free general council. The Catholic Orders should insist on the calling of such a council; that meanwhile the Protestant Orders will do all in their power by the help of God to promote peace, and will so administer their affairs as to give account to God and to the Emperor.*

This paper, which in all probability was written by Chancellor Brück, is firmer and more decided in tone than any other Protestant paper that had preceded it during these negotiations. There can be no doubt that the Protestant Three had been strengthened and stimulated by the opposition shown to the concessions of the Seven. They had remembered their instructions. They probably saw the danger of schism in their own ranks. The Saxons and the Margravians, who had taken the lead in these peace negotiations almost to the exclusion of their allies, could not afford further to risk the alienation of the Lüneburgers, the Hessians and the Evangelical cities. By some means, perhaps by the clear-righted criticisms of their allies, the Committee had come to see that the Catholics were ruled by the principle of ecclesiastical authority, by tradition, and by the theology of the Middle Ages.† They had also learned finally that the Catholics would not concede their appeal to a general council, except upon the condition that the Protestants, both in doctrine and in practice, should return to harmonious action with the Catholic Church, that is, would themselves again become Roman Catholics.

These discoveries, which become increasingly manifest in the

*Brück's *Geschichte*, pp. 120 *et seqq*; Müller, pp. 821 *et seqq*; Chytraeus, 273 *et seqq*; Förstemann, II., 306 *et seqq*; Latin in Coelestin, III., 59 *et seq.*

†See Eck's letter to Melanchthon, August 27th (C. R., II., 316–7; Schirrmacher, 243–4), in which he says that he would surrender his life in defense of the *opus operatum*.

later negotiations, would naturally lead the Protestants to place more emphasis on their fundamental principle that the word of God must determine and shape all articles of faith and all usages of the Church. Thus the antitheses of the two systems, of Catholicism on the one hand, and of Protestantism on the other, rose into greater prominence. At any rate the Protestants begin now to act more like Protestants. A reaction has manifestly set in, and the Answer of August 28th marks the beginning of the end of the peace negotiations. Henceforth the Saxon and Margravian* leaders take a firmer stand. Of this we have official evidence: On the morning of August 29th the Nurenberg legates are assured by Chancellor Brück that "in his opinion nothing additional would be conceded;" and when on the morning of the same day they lay the Nurenberg Remonstrance before the Elector of Saxony, they receive an apologetic answer about the concessions that had been made in the Committee of Fourteen, and are informed that additional concessions will not be made, at least not until others shall have been consulted. The same morning also Melanchthon and others are commissioned to write a reply to the Catholic Confutation of August 3rd.† Three days later, September 1st, Melanchthon wrote to Luther: "Day before yesterday (August 30th), our conference was closed. We refused to accept the conditions in regard to one part of the Sacrament, the Canon, Private Masses, and Celibacy." ‡

It is sad to reflect that in these later, and in the earlier, negotiations, everything is made to turn finally on subjects which the

*The Margrave, however, is still greatly frightened, as we learn from his conversation with the Elector of Brandenburg, reported by the Nurenberg legates, August 29th. He believes that war is imminent, and that it would furnish a good opportunity for the Turks to carry out their plans, according to the proverb: *Duobus litigantibus tertius ridebit.* C. R. II., 319. But as proof that the Protestant estates as a *whole* had taken a firmer stand, see what the Nurenberg legates report on p. 320: "They did not think that it was obligatory upon them to betake themselves to methods and proposals beyond what had been already made."

†C. R., II., 351; Schirrmacher, 530; Plitt, *Apologie der Augustana*, p. 87.

‡C. R., II., 336.

Confession had treated as "Abuses." The so-called doctrinal articles of the Confession seem to have dropped out of sight; at least they are not held up in this Small Committee as a ground of difference and as a sufficient reason for separation. One may be thankful that in this long contest of over two months so much that is fundamental to Protestantism was saved; but it would be a thousand times more satisfactory, had the Protestants, both in their Confession and in the subsequent negotiations, given a clearer, a sharper statement of the distinctive evangelical *doctrines*, and had made a more valiant defense of those doctrines, as Luther, Melanchthon and others had enunciated and defended them in their private writings.*

But the Catholics were not satisfied with the Protestant Reply of August 28th. The next evening, August 29th, Duke Henry of Brunswick, the Bishop of Liege and Count Hoyer of Mansfeld, took supper with the Elector of Saxony. The Duke and others, in speeches, not all of which were gracious, insisted on the appointment of a new committee to take the matter under final advisement.† The Protestants considered the proposition the next day,‡ but promptly declined it. For some days already there had been a growing unwillingness to make additional concessions to the Catholics, or to engage with them in any further negotiations on the subject of reunion. "Besides on

*Protestant and Catholic historians agree in the representation that the Confession was not composed so as to present a clear and unambiguous statement of the *distinctive* Lutheran teaching. Attention has been called to the fact that in Article IV. it omits the *sola*, which had been the Lutheran watchward, and that in Article XX. it declares that the Lutherans "do not forbid good works." See Ranke, *History of the Reformation* (English translation), V., IX., p. 357; Pastor's *Die Kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen*, pp. 22–27; Baumgartner's *Geschichte Karls V.*, p. 28, 29; Seeberg's *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, II., 330, notes 2 and 3, who calls attention to *eine fatale Diplomatie* with which Melanchthon defends Art. X. in the Apology; Loofs's *Dogmengeschichte*, second ed., p. 368, and note; Maurenbrecher's *Geschichte der Katholischen Reformation*, p. 288; Harnack's *History of Doctrines*, Vol. VII., *passim*; Möller, *Hist. Christ. Ch.*, III., 107.

†Schirrmacher, 248; Coelestin, III., 61a.

‡C. R., II., 334.

that day came Luther's answer, and that gave the casting vote." *

The language in which this final decision of the Protestants

*Dr. H. Virck in *Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte*, IX., 312. (1.) Already on the morning of the 29th, Luther's answer was expected (C. R., II., 322, 327). Written on the 26th it could easily have reached Augsburg by the evening of the 29th, or on the morning of the 30th, since "the messenger must return in haste." De Wette, IV., 147-8. (2.) The next day the Elector asked permission to return home. This he would scarcely have done had he not been convinced by Luther's answer of the futility of any further negotiations. (3.) The promptness and decisiveness manifested in rejecting the proposition of the Catholics shows the presence of a new influence. (4.) Seckendorf says distinctly: "It seemed good to the Protestants, confirmed by Luther's letters, to abstain from that deceitful negotiation for concord." Lib., II., § LXXV.; and Maurenbrecher says: "In my opinion Luther's letters of August 26th to the Elector John, Spalatin, Melanchthon, Justus Jonas and Brentz (De Wette, IV., 140–145) were undoubtedly the deciding factors" (*Geschichte*, p. 411). (5.) On the morning of the 29th Melanchthon informs Luther that his answer has not yet been received (C. R., II., 327). On September 1st, he informs him: "Day before yesterday (August 30th) our conference came to an end. For we were not willing to accept the terms in regard to one part of the Sacrament, the Canon, private masses and celibacy" (C. R., II., 336). See also Enders (*Briefwechsel Luther's*, Vol. 8 : 216, 239), who says: "This letter, as likewise the following of August 26th, came to Augsburg on the 30th." Bernhard Besserer in his letter to Ulm, August 24th, says that a letter has been received from Luther, which shows that he has become "perfectly furious" over the situation at Augsburg. Such a Luther letter as Besserer describes is not extant, but that such a letter had been received at Augsburg, cannot be doubted. As Besserer's letter, which only recently has been published, throws much light on the situation at Augsburg just after the dissolution of the Committee of Fourteen, we give it here in the original: "Aber die Evangelischen haben sich lang mit einander darumb zweyt, vnnd den vssschus nit zugeben wollen, dann es haben die prediger der *schnepf*, *Eyssleben*, auch der von *Lunenburg* zwen vnd der Marggrauen zween prediger ein grossen misfall darab gehapt, das sich der *Melantho* im aussus, so weit hinfur hat gethon, vnd gesagt er handle dem Ewangelio gar zuwider, vnd verstand die sach nit, vnd mug auch also nit erlitten werden. doch vff das Jungst haben die Ewangelischen disen vorangezeigt vssschus auch zugelassen, doch den irn beuolhen, das sy nichts hinder inen bewilligen wollen. Der *Lutter* ist gannz wild, ab der sach, er schreibt in her, was sy darmit mainen, das sy allso in der sach vmb gangen, haben sy ein gutt sach, warumb sy sich nit darbey funden lassen, sey dann ir sach kain nutz, warumb sy nit daruon standen, vnd ist ein weil die meinung gewesen, man wel dem *Luter* her bschreiben, vnd den Keyser vmb glait ansuchen, Aber *Melanchto* hat es gewandt, In Suma Es halt yederman darfur der *Melanchto*

is recorded,* shows a marked change of sentiment. On the morning of the 29th the Elector of Saxony had "graciously heard" the Nurenberg Remonstrance, and, as we have learned, had promised that he would not make any more concessions. And now when Luther's letters came, the change was made complete. In the face of strenuous opposition from their most devoted allies, and in view of Luther's emphatic rejection of the Articles of Agreement, it would have been morally impossible for the Saxons and the Margravians to continue this solemn farce with the Catholics, in which they had not played the most manly and courageous part.

With this action of the Protestants on August 30th, the negotiations for reunion and concord came practically to a close. The crisis was past. The opposition that had set in when the concessions of the Protestant Seven became known, and Luther's letters, had forced the Saxons and the Margravians back beyond the point of danger, and had brought them to a better understanding with some of their allies.† Melanchthon indeed still longs and sighs for peace and reconciliation, and some of the Catholics make fresh proposals, and desire to continue negotiations; but all in vain. The Protestants remain firm, and reply that they cannot concede more than had been already conceded. Luther continues to exhort his friends to steadfastness,‡ while the Elector of Saxony insists on taking his leave of the Diet. Finally, September 22nd, the Protestants offer to read their Apology of the Confession. The next day the Elector, accompanied by his illustrious Chancellor and by his theologians, left Augsburg. His example was followed the same evening by the Dukes of Lüneburg and the Prince of Anhalt, and on the next day by the legates of Reutlingen, Heilbron and Kempten.

Practically the Diet of Augsburg was now brought to a close.

werd den Curfursten verfuern, das die Ewangelischen all zu spott darab worden, der *Luther* wer besser zur handlung wann all die, so allhie sind etc." Kolde *Analecta Lutherana*, p. 148.

*Schirrmacher, p. 248; Coelestin, III., 61a; Sleidan, p. 132.

†C. R., II., 334.

‡De Wette, IV., 154–7.

Further negotiations and conferences could make no essential changes. The Augsburg Confession had passed into history; the *Vergleichsverhandlungen* had come to nought; the Catholics and Protestants were farther apart at the close of the Diet than they had been at its beginning. All subsequent efforts to reunite them have failed. Their fundamental principles are different. Protestantism is based on the word of God. Catholicism is based on the authority of the Church. Protestantism holds that the institutions of men have no dominion over the conscience. Catholicism holds that the institutions of the Church bind the conscience as conditions of salvation. Protestantism teaches that the Confession itself is open to revision and to improvement in statement.* Catholicism pronounces an anathema on all who reject her canons and decrees.†

MELANCHTHON AT AUGSBURG IN 1530.

It is scarcely possible to misunderstand the attitude of Melanchthon during the famous Diet at Augsburg in 1530. He labored with all diligence and sincerity to make reconciliation between the Lutherans and Catholics. This idea possessed him as a consuming passion. He believed, and his Elector believed, that the Emperor had called this Diet for the specific purpose of reëstablishing peace and ecclesiastical unity between the two parties. The realization of such a purpose was in harmony with Melanchthon's nature, and with his convictions of duty to the Emperor and to his country. He knew that his Elector also desired to re-establish harmonious relations with the Catholic Church,‡ of which he and his theologians claimed still to be members. Besides, Melanchthon was an imperialist. He reverenced the Emperor with a veneration that bordered an idolatry. He looked upon him as one of those fabled heroes and demigods that in olden times were believed to walk among men. He esteemed him endowed with all civil, domestic and Christian

*See Bishop von Scheele's *Symbolik*, pp. V. and 31 in Part First, and pp. 80, 81 in Part Second.

†See Council of Trent, *passim*.

‡Fikenscher, *Geschichte des Reichstags zur Augsburg*, p. 140.

virtues, and applied to him the lines in which Horace describes Augustus:

> Hoc nihil majus meliusve terris
> Fata donavere, bonique Divi:
> Nec dabunt, quamvis redeant in aurum
> Tempora priscum.*

As the converse of this imperialistic infatuation he literally hated the republican ideas of the Swiss. He believed that the Swiss were plotting to overthrow the Emperor,† and were seeking union with the Lutherans for the purpose of gaining assistance to carry out their revolutionary schemes.‡ Philip of Hesse, who favored the Zwinglians, he called *Antiochus.*§ In addition, the Swiss held *dogmata intolerabilia.*|| Under these circumstances, and with such predilections and prepossessions, he fancied that his party still stood very near to the Catholic Church, and very near to the Emperor. Hence, apart from union with the Church and agreement with the Emperor, he foresaw only wars, bloodshed, devastation, civil and religious commotions.¶ Such anticipation filled his soul with horror, and controlled every motion of his pen. It led him to compose the Confession "in the sense of the closest possible approximation to the old Church and of harshest separation from the Zwinglians;"** to write to Cardinal Campeggius: "We have no dogma different from the Roman Church," and "we are ready to obey the Roman Church;"†† and "to make good to the Bishops their jurisdiction." ‡‡

Melanchthon also knew the jealousies of the theologians,§§ and the inconstancy, *imbecillitas animi*, of the Protestant Princes.|||| Nearly three years after the Diet he wrote to his friend Hieron-

**Carminum Liber* IV., II. See Melanchthon's letter to John Silberborn, C. R., II., 430 *et seqq.*

†C. R., II., 104, 340.

‡C. R., II., 83, 221; XXIII., 749; Möller, III., 99; *Epist. Judic.*, p. 40.

§C. R., II., 118. ||C. R., II., 25, 104.

¶C. R., II., 382, and *Melanch. Paedagogica*, p. 38.

**Baumgarten's *Geschichte Karls V.* ††C. R., II., 170.

‡‡C. R., II., 81. §§*Melanchth. Paedagogica*, p. 38.

||||C. R., II., 314.

imus Baumgartner, of Nurenberg: "I do not deny that at Augsburg I was much inclined to peace. But I knew ours. You would scarcely believe how far some were from that evangelical constancy and moderation of which they boast."* Twenty-six years after the Diet he wrote to Flacius, his worst enemy, that at Augsburg he had "many to blame him; no one to assist him."† Even the Roman Catholics charged him with obstinacy, and blamed him for the miscarriage of the peace negotiations, and besought him for the sake of Germany and of all the Princes to promote peace and the reunion of the divided Church.‡ Never was a man placed in a more trying position, nor burdened with graver responsibilities. The security of the Empire, the stability of the whole ecclesiastical structure in Germany, seemed to hang on him. Hence we hear him exclaim: "Not by my fault shall peace be destroyed."§ He deserves to be heard in his own defense. Writing to Matthew Alber, August 23rd, he says:

"What condition will posterity be in if the government of the Bishops be destroyed? The civil rulers care nothing about the government of the Church and similar matters of religion. Besides, too many in the churches stand in the way of peace. Hence we have thought it good in some way to join ourselves with the Bishops, lest we be harassed by the disgrace of schism. Therefore we will be easier in conscience after that for the sake of peace we shall have conceded all that can be conceded with a good conscience. Prudent and learned men ought to consider the evil that will result from the dissolution of the government of the Church. As it now is, the Bishops sit on their thrones. These I will not overthrow, but I will preserve them if I can."‖

On the 31st of August he wrote to Camerarius: "Oh that, oh that, I were able, not to confirm the domination, but to restore the administration of the Bishops. For I see what kind

*C. R., II., 632.

†C. R., VIII., 843.

‡See Eck's letter to Melanchthon, C. R. II., 316–7; also C. R. II., 382; Schmidt's *Ph. Melanchthon*, p. 231.

§*Melanch. Paedagogica*, p. 38.

‖C. R., II., 303.

of Church we will have when once the ecclesiastical government shall have been dissolved. I see in the future a more intolerable tyranny than has ever yet been. Besides, we have hitherto conceded nothing to the enemy except those things that Luther thought ought to be conceded, when the matter had been thoroughly canvassed prior to the Diet. Nor will I for the sake of peace concede anything additional."*

After the failure of the peace negotiations Aegidius von Plackery, Chancellor to the Archbishop of Liege, and imperial chaplain, wrote Melanchthon, reproaching him with pride and obstinacy, and beseeching him to use his influence to have the Protestants accept the demands of the Catholics. The reproaches and objurgations of the Chancellor were easily answered. The letter, which has been called "a sad counterpart" to the writer's letter of July 6th to Cardinal Campeggius, is as follows: "I can not reply at sufficient length to Your Most Reverend Paternity, for the reason that I am engaged in preparing an apology to be presented to the Emperor, which is to be somewhat sharper than the Confession, that is, if we cannot obtain justice. You inform me of certain opinions held about me by some of yours, and make the harsh accusation that your Princes are rendered more intractable by my pride and obstinacy. I will first reply briefly to the accusations.

"My manner of life is known to all good men, and can be judged from my recently published private writings. In these matters and controversies of religion, I wish so to act as not to offend God. Hence on God's account I think I ought to ignore those accusations.

"In regard to my obstinacy I reply as follows: If I have been the cause of this tempest, then let the Emperor cast me into the sea as a Jonah, or at once crucify and torture me on the rack. God is my witness that I have sought peace only because I saw that if peace be not established the result will be a union of ours with the Zwinglians. Such a consummation I have with all diligence and fidelity prevented. Should such a union be consummated, the greatest confusion of doctrines and re-

*C. R., II., 334.

ligious practices will in all probability follow. If our opponents would carefully consider this, they would not so persistently stir up war against us. Should war break out, not only would uncounted physical evils follow, such as the devastation of Germany, slaughter, debauchery, sacrilege, rapine, but spiritual evils, that are far worse, would follow, such as confusion and disorder in matters of religion.

"I have already shown in what manner I thought these dissensions can be allayed. I have often shown that peace can be established paucis scilicet et exiguis rebus dissimulatis. In the event of peace we could use our talents in overthrowing heresies. But if our adversaries will not cease to stir up the Emperor against us, though they should overcome us by arms and by violence, they cannot overcome the things that have been written. It is not true, as complained of, that the Princes want to hold on to the property of the Church. This they have affirmed again and again in the assembly of the Princes. Farewell." *

Thus Melanchthon's letters are at once the best exposition and the best explanation of his course at Augsburg. Imperialistic politics, aversion to Zwinglianism, dread of caesaropapism, were the three controlling motives that shaped his course. Under the sway of these motives he conceded too much at Augsburg, but that he conceded more than the Elector and the Margrave wanted him to concede, or that they expressed dissatisfaction with his concessions, cannot be shown.† On the contrary, in the famous Reply of August 28th (see above) they declare that they agreed to the appointment of the Smaller Committee, on the condition that the conclusions reached in the Committee

*C. R., II., 381–3. Bretschneider placed this undated letter about the 19th or 20th of September. But Schirrmacher (p. 246) and Virck (*Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte*, IX., 317, have shown that it was written about the last of August or the first of September.

†So late as September 4th, Melanchthon, describing the resistance still shown by the Nurenbergers, Hessians and Lüneburgers, to further peace negotiations, says: "Ours"—meaning especially the Saxons—"judge that the opportunity of making peace, provided it can be made honorably, ought not to be lost." C. R., II., 340.

of Fourteen;* and even when the Nurenberg legates presented the Remonstrance of their Senate, August 29th, the Elector of Saxony declared in the presence of two of his counsellors that in his judgment the proposals of the Committee of Fourteen "might be admitted without any burdening of the conscience," and that he "had delivered the same in order that it might not be said that this party was undiplomatic (ungeschickt), and would take no account of friendly proposals."†

What more could Melanchthon have said? It was not cowardice nor any selfish consideration, but chiefly the perils of the Princes, the dangers to the Empire, and the impending evils to the Church, the vacillating and uncertain purposes of some of the Protestants themselves, that determined much of his conduct, and forced him to a false position.‡ Even those sharp-sighted and uncompromising Nurenberg legates, Christopher Kress and Bernhardt Baumgartner, so late as August 26th praise the diligence, the anxiety, the toil and conscientious purpose of Melanchthon;§ while August 23rd, 29th, and September 4th, they manifest dissatisfaction with the synchretistic temper of the Elector and the Margrave, and with their frequent visits to the Emperor;‖ and when zealous friends of the Protestant cause at Augsburg suggested to Luther suspicions concerning Melanchthon, the great chieftain at Coburg wrote the gentle and peace-loving Philip: "I would rather believe you than them, but I hope you will not keep anything hid from me."¶

As the situation in which he was placed—that of theological and diplomatic leader to his party—was a complicated one; as every official transaction in which he participated, involved the most far-reaching and momentous consequences to Church and to State, historians will never agree perfectly in judging his con-

*Coelestin, III., 60a; Chytraeus (Latin), p. 282; Müller, 823.

†C. R., II., 322. The Elector also said "he did not suppose that the opposite party would accept the proposals, if it depended on the chief points"—which looks like dangerous experimenting. *Ibid.*

‡C. R., II., 311. §C. R., II., 314.

‖C. R., II., 301, 322, 339. ¶De Wette, IV,, 168.

duct. It was the fate of this man whom nature and talents had fitted preëminently for the study and the professor's chair, to be forced to take part in the practical solution of the great political and ecclesiastical questions of his age. What wonder that he did not fully measure up to every demand of time and circumstance! Who could have done better? Who could have passed through that terrible ordeal without making any mistakes? Who could have acted with a cleaner conscience?* In view of his immortal services to the Reformation we may spread the mantle of charity over his mistakes at Augsburg in 1530.

LUTHER'S LAST LETTERS TO HIS FRIENDS AT AUGSBURG.

It will be recalled that from the beginning Luther did not expect any satisfactory results from the Diet. He, with his clear vision, deep intuition, and firm conviction, more than any other man then living, comprehended the difficulties and antagonisms of the situation. He knew what the Papacy taught. He knew what the word of God taught. He knew that the fundamental motive of Romanism was different from the fundamental motive of Protestantism. His earnest study of the divine word during the two months that preceded the opening of the Diet, had confirmed his convictions of the correctness of the Wittenberg teaching, and of the falsity of the Romish teaching. And, living at a distance, away from the scene of strife and contention, he was in the best possible situation to understand the significance of every movement, and to perceive the futility of prolonged controversy. His quick eye soon saw that not only had "too much been conceded in that Apology,"† but that the whole Protestant cause was likely to be betrayed by the spirit of concession that animated the Protestant leaders at Augsburg. At first he reasoned and argued; then as dangers thickened he threw his sword into the scale, and spoke in tones of authority. He rejected the Articles of Agreement, and pronounced them intolerable. He declared reunion undesirable and impossible. Luther and the Pope cannot be reconciled, unless the Pope re-

*See Schmidt's *Philipp Melanchthon*, pp. 233-4.
†De Wette, IV., 52.

nounce the papacy. Those were heroic words that Luther wrote in his letters of August 26th. They form a glorious part of the history of the Augsburg Confession. At no time did he speak in more commanding accents; nowhere has he offered a clearer exposition of the Protestant fundamental principle. But the representation would not be complete without Luther's later letters. August 28th he wrote to Spalatin: "Grant that you have manifestly made concessions (and that you will not do *Christo favente*) contrary to the gospel, and have shut up that eagle in a bag. Luther will come, do not doubt it, he will come, and will gloriously liberate that eagle. Christ thus lives. He is the truth. Therefore fear not those who triumph by violence and by deceit. Luther is free; also perchance Philip of Hesse is free. * * * Be brave and quit ye like men." * At length growing weary and disgusted with the futile and puerile negotiations for harmony, and longing to see the faces of his dear friends, he wrote Melanchthon, August 11th: "I am beginning to pine away with desire for your return. Oh that you would return, though cursed by the Pope and the Emperor. There is one greater than the Pope and the Emperor and their god, who says: *Salvation is of the Lord, and thy blessing is upon thy people.* The Lord will punish the deceit and wickedness of the Sophists and the Papists."†

On the fourteenth of September, Duke John Frederick and Count Albert came unexpectedly to Coburg. The next day Luther wrote to Melanchthon: "I was glad to see that they had escaped from that mob. Oh that I could in a short time see that you had escaped, since we cannot expect that you will be dismissed. You have done enough and more than enough. Now the Lord will have time for acting, and he will act. Only play the man and hope in him. * * * You (plural) have confessed Christ, you have offered peace, you have obeyed the Emperor, you have borne insults, you have been drenched with abuse, you have not returned evil for evil. In a word you have done the blessed work of the Lord as becometh saints. Rejoice in the Lord and exult, ye righteous. Look up and lift up your

*De Wette, IV., 155. †De Wette, IV., 162.

heads, your redemption draweth nigh. I will canonize you as faithful members of Christ, and what higher honor do ye seek? Is it a small thing that ye have rendered Christ a faithful service; that ye have shown yourselves his worthy members? Far be it from you to esteem the favor of Christ a small thing."*

Finally, September 20th he wrote to Justus Jonas: "Grace and peace. From your last letter, My Jonas, I have learned that you have not yielded to the demands of the enemy, and I learn gladly that I may expect your return any day, whether cursed or blessed. But thunder and lightning are coming to me from a number of ours to the effect that you have betrayed everything, and for the sake of peace will concede more. I shall answer that ours have written that the terms proposed by the enemy have been rejected, and that the matter has been returned to the Emperor. Here I stand, so I believe. And when they so constantly and persistently urge and clamor that Luther has been influenced by you, that he has turned everything over to you, that greater danger threatens from you than from the enemy, that there is greater need of harmony among yourselves, than of treating with the enemy, they force me to exclaim: If things be so, then the devil has made a beautiful schism among us. For the stipulations, which you so appropriately name unvergreifliche unbeschleissliche Mittel (impractical and undecided proposals) I will not tolerate, though an angel from heaven should urge and command it. The enemy will not concede to us a hair-breadth, but we are to concede not only the Canon, the masses, one species, celibacy, the customary jurisdiction, but we are to confess that they have judged correctly and have been falsely accused by us. That is, they want to justify themselves and to condemn us, which means not simply that we recant, but that we curse ourselves over and over again, and bless them. But why do I detain you longer with such things as if you could not see their most base baseness and their monstrous impudence, which is such as can never be forgotten. And what need is there of offering so many stipulations, as if we wanted this? Suppose we grant only the Canon, or the Private Masses.

*De Wette, IV., 164–5.

Either would suffice to overthrow our entire teaching and to establish theirs. Let the old-time jurisdiction be given to the Bishops. Then everything has been still more completely surrendered. Will they, while remaining hostile to the Gospel, tolerate the preaching of the gospel? But I am forced by the harsh and unjust letters of ours to write these things only that they might be the proof that I have written you. For you know that I have heretofore signified how far I thought that jurisdiction might be conceded to the Bishops, and I have warned that you do not concede more. I have also written separately and more fully to the Prince. But I am preaching to deaf ears. Hence, My Jonas, see that I am informed about everything that occurs that I do not like; for I do not think the things contained in your letters are detrimental, inasmuch as the whole matter is to be referred to the Emperor. And be careful not to do anything by which a schism may spring up among ourselves. Let us have peace among ourselves, whatever may happen, though the author of peace, and the arbiter of wars, is greater than peace, and is to be honored more than peace. It is not our business to prognosticate future wars, but simply to believe and to confess. I do not write these things because I think you will make concessions, but because of the more than tragic violence of the letters with which ours scourge me. Moreover I will not concede a hair-breadth to the enemy, seeing that these most insolent and wicked men, inflated and confident because of our weakness, mock us and try to make fools of us. Moreover, I know Eck's character, made what it is not by art, but by nature, so that he is wont to draw off those who dispute with him from the state of the case and from the subject until he lures them into a net apart from the subject. But enough.

"A am almost bursting with anger and indignation. I beseech you, break off negotiations, cease to treat with them, and come back. They have the Confession. They have the gospel. If they want these, let them admit them. If they do not want these, then let them go to their own place. If war comes, let it come. We have prayed and done enough. The Lord has prepared them for the sacrifice, so as to render to them accord-

ing to their works. He will deliver us his people from the burning of Babylon. Pardon me, My Jonas, that I have poured this distress of my mind into your bosom. But what I write to you I write to all. The Lord Jesus bring you back safe and brave, and then make you to rejoice also, Amen. From the Hermitage. September 20th, 1530.

"Yours, MARTIN LUTHER."*

This letter, the last that Luther sent to his friends at Augsburg, is important for the view it gives of the complicated situation, and for the determination it shows on the part of Luther to stand by the gospel, and to defend his friends from unjust accusations, now that they have rejected the final proposals of the Catholics, and have concluded to leave Augsburg. They had done enough, and more than enough. They had composed and delivered the Augsburg Confession. That was enough. They had made many concessions for the sake of peace. That was more than enough. The greatest event of the sixteenth century was behind them, and that event has made their names immortal. *Quidquid ex illis amavimus, quiquid mirati sumus, manet mansurumque est in animis hominum, in aeternitate temporum, fama rerum.*

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL.

In preparing the articles entitled *Melanchthon and the Augsburg Confession* (LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for July, 1897, July and October, 1898), and *Luther and the Augsburg Confession*, (LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for October, 1899, January, July and October, 1900), the following works have been used:

1. Historia Martini Lutheri. By Dr. John Cochleus. Hueber's German translation.

2. Jo. Sleidani De Statu Religionis et Reipublicae Carolo Quinto Cæsare Commentarii, 1557. English Translation by Edmund Bohun, Esq. London, 1689.

3. M. Johann Mathesius Leben Dr. Martin Luthers. 1565.

4. Acta und Handlungen des Colloquii (Altenburg). Wittenberg, 1570.

*De Wette, IV., 169 *et seqq.*

5. Endlicher Bericht und Erklerung der Theologen beider Universitaten, Leipzig und Wittenberg. * * * Wittenberg, 1570.

6. Historia de Augustana Confessione breviter recitata in Academia Regiomontana a Johanne Wigando. Regiomonti, 1574. Reprinted in Cyprian's Historia.

7. Historia der Augspurgischen Confession * * * durch D. Davidem Chytraeum. Rostock, 1576. Later revised and improved editions. Latin in 1578 with Preface by Matthew Ritter. Francoforti ad Moenem. "This edition appeared without the consent of Chytraeus." Rotermund, p. 194. See Preface. Chiefly documentary.

8. Historia Comitiorum Anno M.D.XXX. Augustae Celebratorum. * * * per Georgium Coelestinum S. Theol. Doct. Francofordiae cis Viadrum, 1577. 4 vols. fol. Invaluable for its large collection of original documents. Translations from the German should be compared with the originals.

9. Recitationes Aliquot * * * a Nicolao Selneccero D. Lipsiae, 1583.

10. Gründliche Warhaftige Historia von der Augspurgischen Confession. Kirchner, Selneccer and Chemnitz, 1584.

11. Harmonia Confessionis Augustanae, * * * Studio et opera Andreae Fabricii Leodii. Coloniae, 1586. Roman Catholic, but very serviceable.

12. Oratio Historica de Initiis, causis, et progressu Confessionis Augustanae a Nicolao Selneccero. Hildesiae, 1590.

13. Philippi Melanchthonis Concilia * * * collected by Christopher Pezel. Neustadii, 1600.

14. Exegesis Augustanae Confessionis * * * Auctore Balthasaro Menzero. Frankfurt a. M., 1685.

15. Jo. Benedicti Carpzovii Isagoge in Libros Eccles. Luth. Symbolicos. Editio tertia correctior. Lipsiae, 1690.

16. Viti Ludovici a Seckendorfii Commentarius Historicus Apologeticus de Lutheranismo. Francofurti et Lipsiae, 1692. Controversial, but reliable. Drawn from original sources. Contains much documentary matter.

17. Historie von der Evangelischen Stände Protestation und Appellation * * * Von Johann Joachim Müller. Jena, 1705. Chiefly drawn from the Saxon Archives. Contains many original documents. Standard.

18. Georgii Spalatini Annales Reformationis. Published by Cyprian in 1718.

19. Godofridi Hoffmanni Commentarius in Augustanam Confessionem. Tübingae, 1727.

20. Historia der Augsburgischen Confession * * * aus denen original-acten von Ernst Salomon Cyprian. XLI. Beylagen. Gotha, 1730. Many original documents.

21. Christian August Saligs Volständige Historie der Augspurgischen Confession und derselben Apologie. Halle, 1730. 3 vols. This work, consisting of 3172 quarto pages, contains a vast amount of valuable matter.

22. Jo. Georgii Walchii Introductio in Libros Ecclesiae Lutheranae Symbolicos. Jena, 1732.

23. Henrici Alting Exegesis Augustanae Confessionis. Amstelodami, 1752.

24. Jac. Guilielmi Feuerlini Bibliotheca Symbolica Lutherana * * * Edidit Joh. Bar. Riederer. Norimbergae, 1768.

25. Strobel's Miscellaneen. 3 vols. Nurenberg, 1780.

26. Die Augsburgische Confession * * * Von M. Georg Panzer. Nurenberg, 1782.

27. Kritische Geschichte der Augspurgischen Confession aus Archivalisten Nachrichten. Von Georg Gottlieb Weber. Frankfurt a. M. 1783–4. 2 vols. The most thorough and complete critical history of the Augsburg Confession ever written.

28. Dr. Martin Luther's Briefe, Sendschreiben und Bedenken. De Wette and Seidemann. Berlin, 1825–56. Chiefly Vol. IV. Enders's Luthers Briefwechsel, destined to supersede the De Wette edition, was received too late for use in the text.

29. Libri Symbolici Ecclesiae Evangelicae sive Concordia. Recensuit Carolus Augustus Hase. Lipsiae, 1827.

30. Luther's Works. Erlangen Edition, 1829–86. The Walch edition was published at Halle, 1740–50.

31. Geschichte des auf dem Reichstage zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530 ubergebenen Glaubensbekentnisses der Protestanten * * * Von Heinrich Rotermund. Hannover, 1829.

32. Die Augsburgische Confession * * * Von Dr. J. L. Danz. Jena, 1829.

33. Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530. Von Karl Pfaff. Stuttgart, 1830. 2 parts.

34. Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530. * * * Von Dr. Carl Fikenscher. Nurenberg, 1830. Made use of the Nurenburg "Protocol."

35. Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530. Von M. Facius. Leipzig, 1830.

36. Förstemann's Archiv für Geschichte der Kirchlichen Reformation. Halle, 1831. This is Chancellor Brück's Geschichte der Religionshandlungen auf dem Reichstage zu Augsburg im J. 1530. Very valuable. Much quoted by J. J. Müller, as *Auctor Apologiae Manuscriptae.* Used by Cyprian. In the "Neander Library" of the Rochester Theological Seminary, and in the Peabody Library, Baltimore.

37. Förstemann's Urkundenbuch zu der Geschichte des Reichstags zu Augsburg im Jahre 1530. Halle, 1833, 1835. 2 vols. Original documents only.

38. Corpus Reformatorum (C. R). Halle and Braunschweig, 1834–56. Volume II. contains Melanchthon's letters of the year 1530, and much other original matter, including the "Protocol" or official reports of the Nurenberg legates. Indispensable.

39. Symbolik der Lutherischen Kirche. Von Dr. Eduard Köllner. Hamburg, 1837.

40. Historisch–Kritische Einleitung in die Augsburgische Confession * * * Von Dr. A. G. Rudelbach. Dresden, 1841.

41. Philipp Melanchthon, Sein Leben und Wirken. Von Karl Matthes. Altenburg, 1841.

42. A History of the Reformation in Germany. By Leopold Ranke. Translated by Sarah Austin. Philadelphia, 1844.

43. Confessio Augustana et Apologia Confessionis. Edidit Fredericus Francke. Lipsiae, 1846.

44. Die Symbolischen Bücher * * * Von J. T. Müller, 1847. Seventh edition. Gütersloh, 1890.

45. Comparative Symbolik. Von Karl Matthes. Leipzig, 1854.

46. Philipp Melanchthon. Von Dr. Carl Schmidt. Elberfeld, 1861. Written from the sources.

47. Luther und die Augsburgische Confession. * * * Von H. J. R. Calinich. Leipzig, 1861. Prize Essay.

48. Luther's Antheil an der Augsburgischen Confession. Von J. K. F. Knaake. Berlin, 1863.

49. Niedner's Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, 1865. Pp. 515–629. Article by Englehardt. Also Brieger's Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, Vol. IX., 1888. Article by Virck.

50. Einleitung in die Augustana. Von Gustav Plitt. Erlangen, 1867–8. 2 Parts.

51. The Augsburg Confession. * * * By Charles P. Krauth, D. D. Philadelphia, 1868.

52. History of the Augsburg Confussion. By J. H. W. Stuckenberg. Philadelphia, 1869. New Edition in 1897.

53. Die Augsburgische Confession. * * * Von O. Zöckler. Frankfurt a. M. 1870.

54. The Conservative Reformation and its Theology. By Charles P. Krauth, D. D. Philadelphia, 1871.

55. Apologie der Augustana. Von Gustav Plitt. Erlangen, 1873.

56. Martin Luther. Sein Leben und Seine Schriften. Von Dr. Julius Köstlin. Elberfeld, 1875. Later editions. 2 vols.

57. Creeds of Christendom. * * * By Philip Schaff, D. D., LL. D. New York, 1876. 3 vols. Later editions.

58. Gieseler's Church History. English Translation. New York, 1876–80. 5 vols. Vol. IV. for the History of the Reformation.

59. Briefe und Acten zu der Geschichte * * * des Reichstags zu Augsburg 1530. Aurifaber's Manuscript. Pub-

lished by Schirrmacher in 1876. Gotha. Chiefly original documents. Very valuable.

60. Dr. Joh. Aug. Ernesti Praelectiones in Libros Symbolicos Eccles. Luth. Berlin, 1878.

61. A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession. By Charles P. Krauth, D. D., LL. D. Philadelphia, 1878.

62. Die Kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen * * * Von Dr. Ludwig Pastor. Freiburg in B. 1879. Drawn from the sources. Roman Catholic.

63. Geschichte der Katholischen Reformation. Von Wilhelm Maurenbrecher. Nördlingen, 1889.

64. Mitteilungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Nürnberg. Viertes Heft. Nürnberg, 1882. Original letters.

65. The book of Concord; or the Symbolical Books of the Evang. Luth. Church. * * * By Henry E. Jacobs, D. D. Philadelphia, 1882, 1883. 2 vols.

66. Analecta Lutherana * * * Von Dr. Theodor Kolde. Gotha, 1883. Original documents.

67. Der Briefwechsel des Justus Jonas. Von Dr. Gustav Kawerau. Halle, 1884. 2 vols.

68. Martin Luther. Eine Biographie. Von Theodor Kolde, 1884, 1893. 2 vols.

69. Dr. Johann Eck. Von Theodor Wiedemann. Regensburg, 1885.

70. Geschichte Karls V. Von Hermann Baumgarten. Stuttgart, 1885–92. 5 vols.

71. Salnar's Harmonia Confessionum Fidei * * * Published by Dr. Ebrard. Barmen, 1887.

72. Kirchengeschichtliche Studien. Von Theodor Brieger, *et al.* Leipzig, 1888.

73. Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte. Von Friedrich Loofs. Halle, 1890.

74. Die Konfutation der Augsburgischen Bekentnisses, Ihre Gestalt * * * Von Johannes Ficker. Leipzig, 1891.

75. Lehrbuch der Symbolik. Von Gustav Friedrich Oehler. Second Edition by Theodor Hermann. Stuttgart, 1892.

76. Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Von Dr. Reinhold Seeberg. Erlangen und Leipzig, 1895, 1898.

77. Symbolik. Von Professor E. F. Karl Müller. Erlangen und Leipzig, 1896.

78. Die Augsburgische Konfession lateinisch und deutsch * * * Von Dr. Th. Kolde. Gotha, 1896.

79. Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte, Gotha, 1896.

80. Symbolik oder Confessionelle Principienlehre. Von Dr. K. F. Nösgen. Gütersloh, 1897.

81. Wilhelm Möller's The History of the Christian Church. Vol. III. 1900.

82. Real-Encyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche. Third edition.

ARTICLE III.

A CHAPTER IN MODERN CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.

By Rev. C. F. Sanders, A. M.

The subject chosen for this paper is very general. It allows choice of material from the entire range of Christian Evidence. It is, however, also specific. That it should be a chapter would confine it to a specific proposition. The specific proposition we have in view is the tangible fruits borne of Christianity in our own times in proof of its divine origin, its divine motive, and its divine destiny. I still further limit myself to the fruits of historical manifestation and those witnessed to in experience. This still leaves us in a large field. I shall not presume to give a full or even thorough presentation. Even if I were competent to this, the limits of the paper would preclude the possibility. I shall only indulge the humble hope of suggesting the force of these evidences from my point of view; not that my faith in Christianity rests alone upon these, but that these are evidences which touch the period of history with which my own life has to do testifying to the presence of an energy in the affairs of men manifestly divine.

While every age is acted upon by the preceding ages to a greater or less extent, and will act upon succeeding ages in

some proportion to its practical energy, nevertheless, the problems of each generation are in a large sense peculiar to it. England had its period of Deism; Germany its period of Rationalism, and I suppose the future historian will write of our times, The Age of Scientific Scepticism.

The Christian preacher must remain an apologist for Christianity so long as he remains with his religion in the sphere where the enemies of Christ can make assault, for so long is the herald of the cross a soldier enlisted in an incessant warfare. For the glory and the success of the cause there isn't any Dogmatic or Apologetic knowledge which will come amiss. The largest amount of information and the highest intellectual grasp will always find room here for severe exercise.

In our own times the presumption of science has resulted in an undue amount of Scepticism. The progress of victory will be measured by the strength of conviction on the part of the teachers and the consequent confidence of the taught in the things pertaining to the Christian religion. Against Scepticism there is no weapon so effective as unfaltering faith. There is no disrespect to the faithful implied when some one says that the prevalence of honest doubt begets a feeling of suspicion in the heart of the most zealous believer. Paul warning Timothy not to "be carried to and fro by every wind of doctrine" indicates to me that even to the heroic Apostle to the Gentiles disastrous results from false doctrines were not inconceivable in the well-instructed and well-grounded Timothy; and the warning seems to imply that Paul himself had been troubled. It becomes us to keep our convictions clear and to establish the confidence of the very weakest. Our duty takes us even farther; we should seek to convince the gainsayer and doubter.

It concerns us first to say a word as to the credibility of evidence. Science boasts of being exact, and Scepticism denies exactness to the evidences offered in defense of Christianity. Let us see how well the sciences fulfil their claim. An illustration each from a few must suffice. Geology accepts the glacial theory of Agassiz in explanation of the striation on rocks and the varieties of vegetation that belong to other latitudes finding

their way far from their habitat as well as for the formation of hills and valleys. The theory stretches back into the remote past millions of years and rests upon the strength of the inferences. It is accepted as scientific because it explains geologic phenomena best. That it does not solve some of the problems in geology does not confuse us. If anyone should object to the theory because of some things it does not explain, the burden of proof lies with him to show the absolute incompatibility of the theory from these problems. Astronomy is called an exact science, and yet Professor Newcomb has recently used the following language: "Of the distance of the sun we may say, with a reasonable approach to certainty, that it is 92,000,000 miles and some fraction of another million; and if we should guess that fraction to be 400,000 we should probably be within 200,000 miles of the truth." It is said that the lowest musical tone consists of pulsations of air at the rate of thirty per second; while it is estimated that the undulations of the cosmic ether producing green light are at the rate of 600 quatrillion (written with twelve ciphers after the 600) per second. It is evident, therefore that we have a measure of apprehension of things which we cannot comprehend. It is very evident that what we know is as nothing to what we know not. But the very fact that there is still so very much beyond what we know renders the little we have more secure. From these illustrations, and they could be very largely multiplied from every field of science, I conclude that science regards probable evidence sufficiently conclusive to require the critic to disprove it before he may have right to ask for more evidence. As Butler says: "In questions of difficulty, * * * if the result of examination be that there appears upon the whole any, the lowest, presumption on one side, and none on the other, or a greater presumption on one side, though in the lowest degree greater, this determines the question, even in matters of speculation; and in matters of practice will lay us under an absolute and formal obligation, in point of prudence and of interest, to act upon that presumption or low probability. * * * To expect a distinct comprehensive view of the whole subject, clear of difficulties and ob-

jections is to forget our nature and condition, neither of which admit of such knowledge with respect to any science whatever." We note further also that in the practical affairs of life, and therefore in matters of religion, we are guided more by the knowledge gained by inference than by any other kind of knowledge, for inference is the only possibility by which our deductions and experiences can at all be projected into the future in order to become of practical service to us.

It is my purpose now to show from reference to history of our own times and the experiences of men in our own times that there is an energy manifest in the affairs of men which testifies that Jesus Christ in the Son of God. While we cannot write under our conclusions "quod erat demonstratum" as we would do to the proof of a geometrical theorem, the evidence is such that the deductions establish the inference that the Christian postulate is true and that the only rational attitude towards it is to believe in it as implicitly as the mariner believes in his compass. In both cases, but in different senses, the belief definitely determines the direction of travel. The belief is only valuable for action.

The frontier line of Christian conquest has been most wonderfully expanded during the century now closing. During the life time of our oldest acquaintances the kingdom of God has accomplished a most remarkable work of aggression. The transformations wrought in every quarter of the globe surpass anything witnessed since the days of the Apostles. Seventy-five years ago the islands of the South Sea were the terror of the civilized world. The name Fiji sent a thrill of horror through everyone acquainted with the bloody atrocities of cannibalism. With language that vividly plays on the imagination, Pierson tries to show us a picture of the condition of that awful specimen of humanity. He says in the second series of his Miracles of Missions: "If one could dip his pen in the molten brimstone of hell's fiery lake, he could still write no just account of the condition of the Fijians fifty years ago. Two awful forms of crime stood like gates of hell to let in demons and shut out Gospel heralds: First, infanticide, and second cannibalism. Of all

children born, at least two-thirds were killed at birth; and to make sure of their death, there was a system of organized destruction, and every village had its authorised executioner to repeat the tragedy of Bethlehem's babes. Of course infanticide and parricide go together; and so, if the parents did not spare their offspring, neither did the offspring spare the parents, but despatched them when old or feeble." I can't conceive of any condition of humanity more loathsome and degraded than what the Fijians are known to have been. It stands at the farthest remove from the conditions in lands where the gospel has had its influence impressed. And there is force in Lowell's challenge to Infidelity and Atheism that if Christianity is distasteful to them, the fact that they do not choose for their place of habitation these places of farthest remove from Christian influence very largely destroys confidence in their sincerity.

Into that hideous condition of humanity the Missionary of the Cross entered in the second quarter of our century in the hope of its redemption. Who else could have dared to go? Who else could have dared to hope for the redemption of such a people? We say this with the tone of triumphant challenge; but we change our tone when we ask again, who else would have cared to go? This comment upon the natural human heart affects the boast of human superiority over animal creation damagingly. The natural history of morals fails to tell of any undertaking for the improvement of human conditions that will at all compare with this attempt. Love of country will inspire patriotism and be a sufficient explanation for deeds of valor and personal sacrifice; love of adventure may explain much of the daring manifested by men who pushed through forest and jungle to discover new lands; love of wealth will explain why some have dared the tropical jungle, and the Arctic winter in the frozen Klondike; but it is the love of humanity for Christ's sake that is the only sufficient explanation why a rational being should undertake the redemption of the Fijis as the missionaries of the gospel have done. Theirs was not a conquest for gold or spices. They did not go at the head nor in the wake of military demonstration. No earthly king anxiously watched the tide of battle.

Their march forward was not dependent on any promise of miltary intervention in case of harm.

I contend that the spectacle of a solitary missionary and his wife, without sword of steel, without musket, without prestige—for among cannibals the only prestige knowable is the prestige of a warrior or glutton—but with the cross as his standard, the Bible as his guide and consolation, his faith in God his only defence; the spectacle I say of such an undertaking, that a handful of humanity should disembark upon such an island under such circumstances and maintain themselves there receives a sufficient explanation only on the Christian view of the divine power present in Christianity.

But the Missionaries to the South Sea Islands did not only accomplish this spectacle before the world. They have also realized their hope. The islands are already Christian in part and all are rapidly becoming so. Where cannibalism was dominant a century ago we find the same race of people sitting "clothed and in their right mind." Says one: "The murderous baptism of blood has given place to the gracious baptism of cleansing." Says another: "The grand-children of these former savages have contributed thirteen thousand rupees to the famine sufferers in India. Can cannibals be rescued by the power of the gospel? Yes, and they can be made to sympathise to the extent of generous liberality towards a strange and distant people who are famishing for bread."

I have taken the Fijis for my first reference, for I regard the triumph of the Gospel there the most remarkable on record anywhere. There cannot be any doubt as to the fact of the transformation wrought. It cannot be said that the transformation proceeded from either native philosophy or native religion, for native philosophy there was none and the native religion is the curse that has been removed. It must be conceded that the manifest transformation has been wrought solely by the power of the gospel of Christ, for it is the only power that was at work in the period of transition. I will come back to this conclusion a little farther on.

Fortunately for humanity not all of the race outside of Christian influence has been left to suffer the extreme depths of possible human cruelty. Even to our own day there remains a large proportion of the civilized race under the spell of idolatry. True, they have religion. Some of them have attained a high state of civilization. Some of them have authentic history reaching back to times antedating the Patriarchs, with tradition and legend reaching into the mists of the very early antiquity of the race. I am not in the least confused by the fact that in all these centuries the revelation of God as expressed in his Son Jesus Christ has not come to them. It is not scientific to demand an answer why God should have passed them by for so long a time. If it is scientific for the geologist to rest the theories of the processes through which order was called out of chaos and the earth became fit for the habitation of man in time measurements covering many millions of years, it would certainly be unscientific to demand that in spiritual processes the results must be within a definite or fixed period of time. I claim that the Christian conception of the kingdom of God evangelizing the world by the energy of the divine power inherent in the name of Jesus Christ is in no way confined to a nameable number of years. We allow the evolutionist to speak of indefinite periods of time in the vaguest possible terms, but we agree that his theory is scientific, if only it harmonizes. We believe his theory as far as he has harmonized, it and the length of time does not trouble us. His inferences are projected into the past a thousand or possibly a hundred thousand times as many years as the time the Christian claims God has been seeking to reveal himself to the world through the revelation made by his Son. It must be scientific, therefore, to anchor our faith in the authenticity of the Christian hypothesis of a divine revelation if only we can harmonize the possibility of the world's redemption by the power manifest in the Christian religion even though it should take countless ages.

It is not necessary that we should say anything of the failure of the religion of the Chinese, of India or Persia. The course of our inquiry is to find out whether among the people where

ethnic religion has failed, Christianity can accomplish its purpose. Or rather whether the gospel has borne fruit among civilized heathen which would evidence its divine testimony. The very fact that the believer in the divinity of Christ should make the attempt of telling the gospel story to the followers of Brahm, Budha or Confucius, is an assumption on the part of the Christian Church that our religion contains a vital principle which these ethnic religions do not have, and which they need, and which Christianity can supply. Through a century of the most marvellous missionary enterprise the conviction has become settled that man's nature craves that which Christianity alone can supple. In Persia to day we find the habits and customs that compare with the age of the Patriarchs. In China we find only relics of a former greatness without inherent power to awaken out of the deep sleep into which the hermit nation fell a thousand years ago. In India the Hindu philosophy has evaporated the idea of spirit into the thin air of the most vague speculation. These standing monuments of what man left without the special revelation made through Jesus Christ, may become, form the dark background which brings out the more splendid glory of Christianity in the picture of the civilization of the modern world. "Say what we please by way of criticism, it does not take long to perceive that the civilization of Europe and America is infinitely superior to that of the orient. It is equally clear that the civilization of our times has not been the cause but the product of our religion." We find also that Christianity which has brought us the blessings which contrast us so favorably with the orient, is producing the same blessed results on the territory of the effete ethnic religions We are, therefore, in the presence of an accumulation of evidence drawn right from the records of our own times which demand an explanation.

In the mass of evidence the chief elements are the following: The most soul-satisfying civilization the world has ever known is that produced by the Christian religion; those most closely identified with the idea and propagation of this religion have caught the inspiration of its doctrine which declares it to be for

the universal redemption of the race; this inspiration has been sufficiently strong to concentrate the best energy of the entire Church to the accomplishment of its project; in the undertaking is shown the incomparable altruism of its central teaching by the fact of its persistent effort to realize its promise by the willing gift of liberal contributions and the consecration and sacrifice of its truest followers; the undertaking is proved well founded in the tidings of victory from every corner of the wide world; the heathen inheritance and the possession of the uttermost parts of the earth is being realized. Put this array of facts into the test tube of historical criticism, heat it to a white heat over the lamp of exact Logic, turn on it the X-Ray of the highest critical principles deducible from the philosophy of history, that even in matters of mind and spirit every effect must have an adequate cause, and bring to the result an honest heart, and bid it write with precision its conclusion. It cannot be other than that the name of Jesus is the power which is evangelizing the world. The one name which explains the inspiration, the motive, the aspiration and the result of Foreign Missions is the name of Jesus. Thus far there is scientific demonstration. Even John Stuart Mill acknowledged that "religion can not be said to have made a bad choice in pitching on Jesus as the ideal representative and guide of humanity;" and Lecky, by no means favorably disposed towards Christianity, admits that the "simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and to soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers, and all the exhortations of moralists." This demonstration carries with it the acceptance of the authenticity of the revelation by Jesus Christ as exhibited in the New Testament by that part of the human race which has enjoyed the highest blessings of our times and done most to bless humanity generally. We go beyond positive demonstration into the sphere of highest probability when we claim that this evidence justifies the inference that Jesus is divine. The only alternative for the inspiration, motive and results of Foreign Missions is founded on delusion. This involves the absurdity that rational creatures undertake their grandest enterprises and enjoy their

richest blessings by virtue of delusion which is a self-destructive theory, for that the rational should be inspired and in turn blessed by the irrational is manifest incongruity.

Frederick Wright has said carefully: "The demand for unattainable certainty leads in military matters to inactivity; in business affairs, to stagnation; in science, to empiricism; in philosophy to agnosticism; and in religion to scepticism." We come, therefore, to the proposition used at the beginning of this paper, Belief is of value only for action. If man has no care as to which direction he travels, or whether he travels at all, or to what harbor he is tending, he has no need to believe the directions of his compass. If man has no interest in the harmony of the spheres he has no need to believe the law of gravitation. If man places no value on character he has no need to believe in the power of habit. If man is not concerned about the longings of his spiritual nature he has no need to believe in any manner of religion. But the facts of history prove conclusively that man does have interest in these things, and he must have belief for action in every one. We conclude, therefore, that the belief for action in matters pertaining to his spiritual nature, for the facts given—the divinity of Christ—is the only one that lays proper claim on him as the only sufficient explanation (scientific if you please) of man's spiritual nature. To every doubter of the credentials of the Christian system, I reply as Philip did to Nathaniel, with absolute confidence that the subject will bear acquaintance: "Come and see."

I wish yet to speak of the evidence for the truth of the Christian religion in experience. As Flint says: "There is no truth more requiring to be borne in mind by the Christian Apologist than that Christianity is an essentially practical thing, and that, consequently, like every such thing, a real and sure knowledge of it can only be practically, experimentally acquired. No amount of proof, no accumulation of evidence, on behalf of Christianity can be trusted to produce an assured Christian faith, an entire, an active Christian certitude, in those who do not comply with its requirements as a moral and spiritual life—who do not so yield themselves to its influences as to experience its

practical power. This does not imply that Christian experience is a substitute for other evidence, or warrant us to dispense with other evidence. We cannot have Christian experience except by appropriation of Christian truth, and, if there be Christian truth to appropriate, that truth must have evidences by which it may be recognized and by which experience is enlightened and sustained. Yet none the less is the true path to an assured certainty of Christian truth the practical realization of it in the life. So experience testifies. And it only confirms the words of the Master, 'My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.' "

Space forbids citing personal testimony here to any great extent. But this is something not hard to find and that which will be most conclusive will be that sought out by the inquirer himself. John G. Paton's personal testimony to the writer as to the condition of his emotions in times of extreme peril to which he was often subjected in the New Hebrides, is: "I knew God would keep me from harm or do something better." In the early part of the century Africaner, a powerful savage chief of Central Africa, was won to Christ by the preaching of Robert Moffat. Africaner, dying as a Christian after having proved the reality of his regeneration by years of earnest Christian zeal leaves this testimony: "My former life is stained with blood; but Jesus Christ has bought my pardon, and I am going to heaven."

A noted professor of science recently gave this personal testimony. He was in conversation with acquaintances of his younger days. They knew him to have been sceptical concerning matters of religion. They were surprised at his conversation turning with such reverence to the subject of his own personal faith in Christianity. They asked him to tell what had wrought the change. His response was: My mother was a devout believer in Christ. I knew her profession was honest. When she died commending me to the love and tender mercy of her God I resolved that as a scientific man I could not afford to condemn such a mother's religion without a thorough inves

tigation. The result is my conversion to the faith in the divine Jesus who has redeemed my soul.

"One of the ablest and purest skeptical critics of the century, De Wette, made the sad but honorable confession:

> I lived in times of doubt and strife,
> When childlike faith was forced to yield;
> I struggled to the end of life,
> Alas! I did not gain the field.

"But he did gain the field at last; for a few months before his death he wrote and published this significant sentence: 'I know that in no other name can salvation be found, than in the name of Jesus Christ the crucified, and there is nothing higher for mankind than the divine humanity realized in him, and the kingdom of God planted by him.'" (Schaff.)

These references to personal testimony taken from totally different circumstances of life, witnessing to the identical truth to which the voice of united Christendom bears corroborative testimony, are nothing less than the testimony from these witnesses that in their religious experience they each have what to them is practical demonstration that the "power not ourselves which makes for righteousness" is the divine in the Christian religion. This testimony comes from the noblest specimens of the race. These have contributed the highest blessings upon humanity which humanity enjoys. It is unscientific to disregard the evidence of their testimony. On the other hand science is under obligation to accept the evidence as conclusive, unless it can displace it with some hypothesis which will better harmonize the spiritual requirements and relations of man. This is its universal policy in other matters, and it cannot evade responsibility here. We claim that the Christian belief, as witnessed to by the fruits of every variety of mankind, the savage, the pagan, the professed unbeliever, and the Christian, has every presumption in its favor, which, as Butler says, "in matters of practice will lay us under an absolute and formal obligation." Our conclusion, therefore, is that the power that moves Princes to acknowledge the humblest peasant as his brother, the most favored of earth to extend his hand to the rudest savage, and say, come,

my brother, and share my blessings, is the divine Jesus Christ. To the objector outside the circle of believers who says this is not demonstration, we say, come in and see. If he would depreciate belief as compared with knowledge I answer that all knowledge is dead only so far as it serves for inference to awaken belief, *for belief, not knowledge, is the spring of action. Belief is therefore master, and knowledge is slave. Belief is the way of life opening out before us moment by moment; knowledge is the bundle of thorns and roses we have plucked by the way. We must carry our knowledge; our belief carries us. I repeat, by comparison in so far as there is distinction between knowledge and belief, the former is dead form and matter, the latter is the breath of like.* If he would argue that it would take a man a lifetime to complete such an investigation, I answer, that is true, and I should regard the investment of life*time* fore life *eternal*, a good contract. But the sceptic may still retort, But what if you should then lose, I bow my acknowledgements, and ask, What is there to lose?

Let us now summarize our conclusions. We have found that the Gospel of Christ effectually regenerates the Cannibals; it eonvinces Christendom of the universal need of redemption, and furnishes the impulse to attempt the redemption of the race; it is the conviction of Christendom that the redemption of the race is possible only by the power of the Gospel; the Gospel of Christ demonstrates its power to supply the want among pagan nations; in the experiences of men it is witnessed to as being "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." There is, therefore, manifest in the history of our own times and in the experiences of men of our own times, conclusive evidence that the Gospel of Christ operates in the nineteenth century with results identical with those of the first century of the Christian era. If we could cut the century loose from the preceding ages and look at it with all our knowledge of preceding times left blank, without chronologies or history save only the New Testament, we would have to find the explanation of the age in the record of the divine life it portrays. To attempt a picture of humanity without the New

Testament and without its fruits, and without reference to it, would be very like an attempt to picture the earth without the sun and its influences; it would be "without form and void." As astronomy requires the law of gravitation in order to explain the harmony of the spheres, geology the evolutionary theory to explain the periods of earth-formation, psychology a personal age to explain mind, religion requires Jesus Christ to explain person and spirit.

A word in conclusion as to how far this evidence reaches towards proving Jesus divine. The gospel must stand or fall by the strength or weakness of its central thought—the divine Jesus revealing the love of God for the redemption of humanity. It cannot be disputed that the power manifestly operating was from above, for all it has to tell is of things higher than those natural to man. It gives a conception of God which satisfies and harmonizes; it teaches and reveals a morality that is higher than man has anywhere accomplished of himself; its doctrine of immortality is complete; its worship is the expression of the relation between the creature and the Creator; these require us to postulate of him that brought the revelation that he is divine. He rests the validity of his revelation upon his divine origin. He promises what his revelation shall accomplish. It accomplishes what he promises. We cannot acknowledge the one and reject the other.

I am not conscious of having overstated any truth. My aim has not been to boast of the glory of the Christian religion, but rather to show that in our times we have evidence with all the balance of probability in favor of the divinity of Christ, in such a way that an unbeliever is necessarily on the defensive when he assails the truth of the Christian religion.

I conclude with a quotation from Dr. Storr's "Divine Origin of Christianity:" "The Christian faith seems to me to glorify life, it seems to me to banish the shadow of gloom from death, to feel that the majestic figure—of Brother, Teacher, Friend, Redeemer—which towers supremely over the centuries, which made the earth sublime by its advent, which seemed in ascend-

ing to unite it to the heavens, has equal place in worlds to come! That we may trust his imperative word; that we may serve his kingly cause; that we may see the illumined universe, for us as for him, a house of victory and of peace; that we may stand, by and by, with him, amid the light as yet unreached, and say, each one: I believed in thy religion; I saw its tr' umphs in the earth; I felt its power in my heart; I rose to God in love upon it; I foreknew by it, what now I find—Eternal life!"

ARTICLE IV.

THE COVENANT PEOPLE AND THEIR PART IN THE PROMISES.

By Rev. J. F. Pollock.

It is of great importance, in biblical interpretation, to determine the essential character of the people of God under all dispensations. If the promises of God in the Old Testament are to a race, then there is a marked difference in the two Testaments. If those promises are not to a race, but to a people organized into a corporate community the uniting bond of which was faith in God revealing himself in his grace and goodness to sinful man, then there is harmony between the two Testaments; and if the faith of the Old Testament looked forward to a Messiah, and trained the people to see and rest upon him for salvation, then when the Messiah appears, the people of God will be the people receiving him as their head, and depending upon him, in all his officies, for life and blessedness. All the promises of God will then be yea and amen, to the covenant people of Christ, and Abraham will be the father of the whole body of the faithful.

And the first important consideration bearing on the subject is the character of the community of which Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were successively the heads.

Annexed to the call of Abram was the promise in which God engaged to make him a great nation (Gen. 12 : 2); and this pro-

mise was repeated to the patriarch (18 : 18), and to Jacob (35 : 11). When the latter went down to Egypt he was informed that the promise was to be fulfilled in that land (46 : 3). The greatness of the nation consisted in two very comprehensive particulars: First, God was near to the people in all that they might call upon him for; secondly, the nation had revealed to them a righteous law for their government and training (Deut. 4 : 8).

Now a nation (goi) is a corporate community, and the same term used in the promise to Abram and to Jacob is applied to the nations generally and is translated by the terms, nations, Gentiles and heathen. As a corporate community there is no contrast between the nation Abram was to become, and the other nations of the earth. The contrast is altogether in the character of the bond uniting the members of the community.

From one of the branches of the Semitic peoples, Abram was called out of a condition of previous idolatry (Jos. 24 : 2) to become an elect community, the members of which were bound together by faith in God revealing himself to them from time to time, as the community needed revelation and as they were able to receive it (Heb. 1 : 2). He was seventy-five years of age when he entered Canaan as a childless man, at the head of a nomadic community. After a brief sojourn in Egypt, he and Lot parted company, because they had grown too great to dwell peaceably together, on account of the disputes of their servants. A short time after the separation, when Lot was taken captive by the enemy which invaded the vale of Sodom and the neighboring cities, Abram was able to arm 318 trained servants to rescue his nephew (Gen. 14 : 14). The haste with which these were armed and the enemy overtaken before the northern boundry of Canaan was reached, suggests that these trained servants were a sort of standing army, and that Abram had others beside them in his community. Sarah's maid, Hagar, was an Egyptian, and as Pharoah had given Abram men-servants as well as women servants, some of the male community would be made up of Egyptians. His eldest servant was from Damascus, and the community under Abraham may

have been made up of elements from all the peoples between the Euphrates and the Nile. Halévy derives the name Abram from abir, chief, and am, people, and, whatever be the character of the derivation, the position assigned to Abram, when he was called, is undoubted.

In the seventeenth chapter of Genesis this community is taken into covenant relations, and to Abram and his seed God engaged to be "a God," to give them the land of Canaan for an everlasting (olam) possession, and this covenant was to be sealed and signified by circumcision, which was to be in their flesh for an everlasting (olam) covenant. All born in Abraham's house, or bought with his money were to be circumcised, and the uncircumcised soul was to be cut off from his people. That same day, "Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among men of Abraham's house, and circumcised them in the self same day God had said unto him." Abraham himself was circumcised that same day, being ninety-nine years of age. It is in connection with entering into this covenant that Abraham was promised that God would make him a father of many nations, and his name was changed in token of the covenant relation and the destiny appointed to him. Now this covenant community is a community, none of whom are Abraham's seed in any physical sense, excepting Ishmael, and with the divine sanction, he was subsequently separated from it (Gen. 21 : 12). Thus the covenant community at the beginning was a community bound together by the faith of its head.

But more than that, the promise of a son by Sarah is a promise annexed to that covenant, and when Isaac was born, he was born into a community having its fundamental character already established, and under the law of it. In those days, nations were small communities and theocratic in their character. The god acknowledged by the nation, as its invisible ruler, had for his representative the earthly ruler, and before Abraham's day, the kings of Egypt were wont to style themselves sons of Amen, Ra, or Phath. But the hereditary king was subject to the hereditary religion, and Amenhotop IV, belonging to the

eighteenth dynasty, found that he could not readily reform the religion of Egypt. (History of the East by Lenormant and Chevaller, p. 237, Vol. 1).

The community of which Abraham was the head had been under divine training ever since Terah immigrated from Ur of the Chaldees, and when Abraham was ninety-nine the time had come for it to become organized under the bonds of that revelation which had been made to it from time to time since the patriarch began his sojourning. From the Euphrates to the Nile, and back again to Canaan, in scenes of peace and in scenes of strife, the community had seen their chief under divine guidance and protection, and they were ready to become a theocratic community under Abraham as God's representative. No doubt the faith of Abraham was far in advance of the members of the tribe, but the account of Eliezer's journey to Padan-Aram would indicate that he also was a man of faith, and one to whom Abraham could commit the destinies of his house.

The headship of Abraham was continuous for at least a hundred years, and during that time he commanded his house to keep the ways of the Lord, to do justice and judgment, that the Lord might bring upon him all he had spoken (18 : 19). Thus when Isaac was born there was a community which had been under divine training for many years, and had formally entered into covenant with God. Such a community had an interest in preserving the revelations committed to it, and the successive heads came to their office under the law of the community, and for the purpose of guiding it in the way of obedience. Isaac was born to headship in the covenant community; and before Abraham died, he sent away all who might dispute the headship with Isaac, and gave to that son all that he had. Thus the Abrahamic community was not one bound together by ties of blood, but by faith in God revealing himself through Abraham.

The covenant people preserved the same character during the headship of Isaac. He was forty when he was married, and sixty when his twin sons were born, and when Abraham died the boys were fifteen years old. During his life he was prosperous, had a great store of servants (Gen 26 : 14) and was

greater than any of the lords of the Philistines among whom he sojourned (16), so that Abimelech thought it prudent to enter into a treaty with him and exchange oaths in ratification of it (31). With Isaac God renewed the promise to Abraham, and engaged to multiply his seed for Abraham's sake (24). Though he lived 180 years he never had but the two sons, and of these Jacob was chosen to succeed him in the headship of the covenant community (28 : 4),

The manner in which Jacob received the blessing of Abraham from his father necessitated a sojourn in Padan-Aram, and after a sojourn of 21 years he returned to Canaan with men servants and women servants (32 : 5). When Simeon and Levi pillaged Shechem the women and children were added to the covenant community (34 : 29), and when Esau departed from Cannan, the brothers had become so great that the land could not bear them (36 : 6, 7). Ten years later Jacob went down to Egypt with all that he had (46 : 1, 47 : 1). He was one hundred and thirty when he stood before Pharoah (47 : 9), and 215 years had passed away since Abraham had crossed the Euphrates, one half of the 430 years from that event till the Exodus (Ex. 12 : 41); and when two more generations should have passed away the time of deliverance from Egypt would be due (Gen. 15 : 16).

The unreadable story of Judah (c. 38) indicates that the time was ripe for some change in the family of Jacob. Who were the wives of Jacob's sons, we are not informed, except in the cases of Joseph and Judah, and the former was a daughter of the priest of On, and the wife of the latter was of the daughters of the Canaanites. The critics of the present day think that under the figure of marriage and assignation, union with Canaanite tribes may be signified; but be that as it may, it is a matter of record that Judah's daughter-in-law, and the mother of his two sons, Pharez and Zerah, was a Canaanite, and an ancestress of our Lord's humanity. In the descent to Egypt a distinction is to be made between "all that Jacob had," and his immediate descendants—the latter, counting himself and Jeseph and his sons, being seventy souls (46 : 6–27).

Had this been the whole community of Jacob it is exceedingly unlikely that a district as large as Goshen, some 60 geographical square miles, would have been assigned to them, and altogether impossible, without miracle, that they should have overflown it in 215 years, and become a people numbering 603,550 fighting men, besides 22,000 Levites, from a month old and upwards (Num. 2 : 32, 3 : 39). Population is thought to be capable of doubling itself every 25 years, though we have no reliable account of any community having increased at such a rate. But if Jacob's progeny had thus increased, their numbers would have been a long way short of one half of those numbered at Sinai. We must therefore conclude that the people numbered at Sinai was the increase of the whole community of which Jacob was the covenant head, and of this people Jacob was the eponymous ancestor, and his twelve sons bore the same relation to the tribes into which the covenant people was divided.

A proof of this will be found by inspecting the seventy souls which came out of the loins of Jacob. It is made up of four generations, in the first of which is Jacob; in the second Jacob's twelve sons and one daughter; in the third, 51 grandsons, and one grand-daughter; and in the fourth, four great grandsons. It is scarcely probable that in twelve families, having an aggregate issue of 51 sons, there should be only one daughter, and only two females in the issue of three generations. How can we account for only two females in this number of seventy? The answer that seems to me to agree with scripture representations is that it is made up to show the relation of the covenant community to all the families of the earth.

In the tenth chapter of Genesis seventy nations are spoken of as inhabiting the earth. From one of those nations Abraham was called to become a great nation, that in him they might all be blessed. The mediatorial headship of Abraham is brought out in his intercessory prayer for Sodom, and in his intercession for Abimelech, where he is called a prophet (Gen. 20 : 7). In Abraham, Isaac and Jacob the headship of the covenant community was personal, and the promises to Isaac and Jacob are for Abraham's sake. With Jacob the headship in an individual

ceases, and the nation itself becomes the representative nation in relation to the seventy nations which are regarded ideally as inhabiting the earth. So it is called Jehovah's son, even his first-born (Ex. 4 : 22), and in Hosea (4 : 6) a priestly position is assigned to it. As there were not enough of males to make up the number to seventy, two females were added to the 68 males, and the community which goes down to Egypt is thus represented as the priestly community chosen of God to stand between him and a dark world, and receive light from him to shed upon its darkness (Ex. 19 : 4–6). Hence the home of the nation was to be midway between the centers of the ancient civilization which controlled the destinies of the ancient world till the rise of the Greeks and the conquests of Alexander turned the march of civilization westward, and prepared for the Apostles and their successors the language of the gospels. Jacob did not leave the blessing of Abraham to any one of his sons, but the nation itself became the mediatorial community, and the Messianic promise was to be realized in the tribe of Judah.

Hence the number seventy represents the priestly character of the nation, and it was seventy of the elders of Israel who beheld the vision of God's glory at Sinai (Ex. 24 : 1, 9, 10), and seventy elders were chosen to be filled with the spirit of Moses, that they might bear the rule of Israel with him (Num. 11 : 16–17, 24–29), and serve as a check upon the individual rulers of the covenant people, during the time of their representative office. It was this body who inquired of John the Baptist his authority, and received testimony concerning Christ (John 1 : 19–29); and it was this body which rejected Jesus as the Messiah, and sought to kill him at the end of his Judean ministry (5 : 18). They sat in Moses seat, and because of their rejection of the Lord of the vineyard, the kingdom of God was to be taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof (Matt. 21 : 43). To represent this priestly position of the chosen community the progeny of Jacob descending to Egypt is made up to seventy, and of these, his twelve sons became the eponymous ancestors of the twelve divisions of the whole community, and his grand-sons, and great-grand-sons be-

came the eponymous ancestors of smaller divisions within the tribes.

Let the 74,600 warriors of the tribe of Judah be taken, as they were numbered at Sinai a year after the Exodus, and how can that number be thought of as the natural increase of Judah and his three sons in 215 years from the descent to Egypt? The Bible does not hint at anything miraculous, and the Bible miracles are never of a kind, which requires such a tax upon our ideas of that which is possible. But it is well to notice that the Kenites and the Kenizzites appear first among those tribes whose lands God promises to the seed of Abraham in four generations (Gen. 15 : 19), and these appear among the ancestors of the great houses of Judah (1 Chron. 2 : 55, 4 : 12–15); and as Caleb belonged to the latter people, it seems that, before the Exodus, the Kenizzites were received into the tribe of Judah on the same footing as the purest blood in that tribe.

Nor were all the years spent in Egypt years of oppression. Some of Judah's eponymous progeny broke away from a nomadic life, and learned the arts of civilization, and during that time some of them made a settlement in the land of Moab (1 Chron. 4 : 22–23). The same is true of the tribe of Ephraim (1 Chron. 7 : 20–24), and we are told that a mixed multitude, or people, shared in the deliverance from Egypt (Ex. 12 : 38). When the tribes were numbered at Sinai these disappear, and no doubt, they were incorporated among the tribes. A door of entrance into the fellowship of Israel was always open to the stranger (Ex. 12 : 48, 49), and no nationality was excluded, saving the Moabites and the Ammonites, and that exclusion was only for a time. Thus the Israel of God in the Old Testament was a community in which there were none of the patriarch's physical seed at its formation, and at the Exodus, the literal descendants of Jacob in the nation taken into covenant relations with God at Sinai, were comparatively few.

The name Israel is thought to mean, God persists, and it was applied to Jacob at Peniel, because there he appeared as a man in whom God had been persisting, and the divine persistence

was seen in the man, who, while he used all means to placate the wrath of an offended brother, yet looked to God to make all successful, and all alone wrestled by the restless Jabock for the divine favor to be manifested in him. And it is in his character as a man in whom the divine persistence has brought forth fruit, that he becomes the eponymous ancestor of that community in whose history, the history of the only begotten Son of God was to be foreshadowed, and the world prepared to welcome his advent.

When we come to the conquest of the land of Canaan, we find that Rahab and her father's house were incorporated into the tribe of Judah, and her name also appears in the genalogy of Mary's Son. Comparatively few of the cities of the Canaanites were taken and their inhabitants exterminated under Joshua. A foot-hold was given to each tribe, and their inheritance indicated by the lot, but their possession of it depended upon their faithful obedience. Coming among a civilized people with chariots and fenced cities, the invaders took possession of the mountains and hill-tops, where the chariots and horsemen could not be well used, and satisfied with their first successes, they rested from their warfare. Thus they made peace with the Canaanites, and the record is that "they dwelt among them, and took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons, and served their gods" (Jud. 3 : 5, 6). The two peoples thus gradually became one, and shared in the same chastisements for their sins, and in the same mercy which turned to the cry of penitence and granted deliverance. The covenant people had let their opportunity escape, and made covenants with the Canaanites, and so God gave the Canaanite people a place in the land, and spared them to prove Israel by their means. It appears that Israel was the weaker people in numbers, and in northern Israel, in the time of Deborah, the Canaanites came near to securing the mastery (Jud. 5 : 6). For a time a semi-Canaanitish state was set up in Shechem, and Abimelech was prince over Israel for three years (9 : 22). The tribe of Dan did not obtain a settlement in the land the lot gave them, and, in the time of a grand-son of Moses, went to the northern

part of the land, conquered Laish, and called at Dan, and there set up an idolatrous worship (18 : 30). Jerusalem was held by the Jebusites till the time all the tribes united to make David King, and thus for nearly or a little more than four hundred years the people brought out of Egypt were assimilating the inhabitants of Canaan and gradually becoming one people. Hence Saul's assault upon the Gibeonites was regarded as such an infraction of right that the land became blood guilty (2 Sam. 21 : 1, 2). In the services of Saul, Edomites are found, and Philistines in David's; and Uriah the Hittite, and Arunan the Jebusite were Israelites in faith. So we find David estimating his own position thus:

> "Thou has made me the head of the nations:
> A people whom I have not known shall serve me.
> The strangers shall submit themselves unto me,
> As soon as they hear of me they shall obey me."
>
> (2 Sam. 22 : 44, 45).

It is not all figure Ezekiel uses when he says: "Thus saith the Lord God unto Jerusalem, thy birth and thy nativity is of the land of Canaan; thy father was an Amorite, and thy mother an Hittite" (16 : 3, 45). The kingdom of David was largely a Canaanite kingdom, and in the time of Solomon all the subject peoples had been incorporated into Israel except 156,600, and after his day these, for the most part, seem to have been absorbed.

Solomon's numerous marriages, his commercial enterprises and building operations, were a farther reaching out to the nations, and while it brought foreign customs into the nation, and made Jerusalem the shrine of other gods besides Jehovah, it also made David and his reign ideal of better things to come, and gave definiteness to national hopes. The division of the empire of David into two kingdoms tended to conserve religious hopes, and when the Northern Kingdom introduced innovations the godly gathered into the kingdom of Judah and strengthened it. Thus a purer religious community was formed, and Jerusalem became the seat of Jehovah's kingdom over all the nations

in and around the covenant community, and from Zion his judgments were sounded forth to them all (Amos I. and II). On the eve of the fall of the Northern Kingdom the escaped of Israel found a refuge in Judah (Is. 4 : 2), and during the Assyrian invasion remnants from Philistia (Is. 14 : 30), Moab 16 : 14, and Syria (17 : 3), came into the Southern Kingdom, and formed a new Israel. With the fall of the kingdom of Ephriam, Hezekiah became the head of the covenant community, and at the Passover he celebrated, a multitude of people came from the tribes inhabiting the northern portion of the land, and among them were strangers to join themselves to the Lord (2 Chron. 30 : 18, 25). Thus the people of Judah became an Israel and are so called by the prophets and in the later histories.

In the Chaldean invasion the nations around the covenant community were to be chastened, but like Israel, were to be returned to their territories, and have another opportunity to learn the ways of God's people (Jer. 12 : 14–17). A hope of return from exile was given, only to those of Judah carried away with Jehoiakin in 597 B. C. (29 : 16–20), and God's thoughts of peace concerning them were to give them hope and a latter end (Marg. R. V., verse 11). The duration of the captivity of the Northern Kingdom was to be 390 years, according to the Hebrew text of Ezekiel, 350, according to the LXX., and the duration of the captivity of Judah 40 years (Ezek. 4 : 4, 6). During that time both elements of the covenant community were under instruction by the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and in the wilderness of chastisement an Israel was reconstructed (Hos. 2 : 14, 15). A general invitation was given by Cyrus to all who desired to do so to return to the land of Canaan (Ezra 1 : 1–4), and those who embraced it were the children of Israel (3 : 1). God did not leave those who remained in the empire of Persia, but delivered them from dangers, so that when their neighbors saw that God was with them, many became Jews (Esth. 8 : 7). Thus covenant communities were preserved in heathen lands, and these prepared the way of the Apostles and made it possible that in a single generation the gospel could be preached and churches established in all parts of the Roman Empire. In the

time of the Maccabees, the Idumeans, a different people altogether from the ancient Edomites, became Jews by an enforced circumcision (Joseph. Antiq. XIII, ix, 1); and from this people came the Herodian family, and 20,000 Idumeans came into Jerusalem during the Roman invasion, and perished with that guilty city (B. J. IV, iv–v).

It is thus plain, that as a matter of biblical history, the covenant community, God's Israel, was at no time, the natural progeny of the patriarchs, but at all times, it was the corporate community bound together by the faith of Abraham and under the government of a divinely appointed head. This headship was successively in Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, but after this the community became God's son, and under Moses as a typical mediator was brought out of bondage, and organized in the wilderness under a body of laws which had a promise of good things to come. Under David, the nation, in its elements, was largely Canaanitish, and he became the typical head of the nations, and the promise to Abraham concerning the multiplication of his seed became the promise to David (Jer. 32 : 22). The New Testament representations, which declare that they are Abraham's seed who have the faith of Abraham, is thus an Old Testament truth; and God's Israel, the covenant community of this present time is to be found in the communities accepting the headship of Jesus Christ.

If Jesus is not the Messiah, then the covenant people may be the people in our cities and on our streets who are called Jews, and who make some use of Old Testament rites, while they wait for a Messiah yet to come. But on that supposition, the Old Testament, must cease to be regarded as the sure word of prophecy, since the latter end hope of the community under the law began with the return from the Chaldean Captivity, and was to be realized under the latter house (Hag. 2 : 9). The moment that temple became a ruin, that very moment the Providence of God proved that the Messiah had come; and all past economies had their completion in that Messiah and the economy he established. He who was "set up from everlasting" and who had from time to time appeared in some supernaturally assumed

form, and thereby had given direction and authority to a typical and temporary economy, now came in the flesh; and whoever accepts the Old Testament as prophetic, must accept Jesus as the Messiah, whose day Abraham saw (John 8 : 56), whose reproach Moses chose (Heb. 11 : 26), and who followed the Israelites in the wilderness (1 Cor. 10 : 4).

It is commonly thought that the term, Church, is a New Testament idea, and that it has special relation to the Gentiles. But this is not the case. Isaac's blessing to Jacob indicated that he was to become a qahal of nations (Gen. 28 : 3), and this promise was ratified by El Shaddai at Luz (48 : 3). But qahal means the same as the Greek term ekklesia, and the LXX use the latter term most frequently to translate the Hebrew term qahal. In the twelve tribes we have the nations referred to in the blessing of Isaac and El Shaddai; and in those nations bound together by religious bonds, we have the qahal, the assembly or Church of God on earth.

When our Lord declared that he would build his Church on the rock of men confessing him (Matt. 16 : 18), the emphatic term is not the word church, but the pronoun, my, and that pronoun as referring to the Christ manifested in the flesh, and whom men thought of so differently. There was a Church in the wilderness of the wondering (Acts 7 : 38), and in the midst of it Christ was to cause the praises of God to be sung (Heb. 2 : 12). That Church was an "olive root" into which there had been much ingrafting during the history of the temporary economy; and when Christ came to his own things, and his own people rejected him, they proved that they were his own, only in a formal and outward sense. Hence his determination to build his Church on the rock of men confessing him from the revelation granted them by the Father in heaven. Thus the Church would continue to be what it ever had been, an assembly of mortals bound together by the operations of God's grace in the heart.

Christ began the building of such a Church immediately after his rejection by those who sat in Moses' seat. By his Galilean ministry, a body of disciples were gathered, and from

these he chose twelve men to be the nucleus of a new Israel. These he appointed to judge the twelve tribes of Israel (Luke 22 : 29, 30) and the Church is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone" (Eph. 2 : 20). From the body of his disciples he also sent our seventy evangelists (Luke 10 : 1), and the sending out of these indicated the same truth as the baptism and preaching of John Baptist, namely that those who thought of themselves as Abraham's seed, were in the same condition of moral and spiritual estrangement from God as the Gentiles. Hence Christ gives to his disciples the same outward organization as that in the Old Testament which indicated the Israel of God as a priestly people chosen to mediate between him and the world in darkness; and it is this feature of the Church which receives special emphasis in the New Testament (1 Pet. 2 : 9). The universalism of the Old and the New Testaments has the same root in God's love and grace toward men, and Christ is the world's Saviour.

In forms essentially the same as those which indicated the choice of Israel as a priestly people at Sinai, and pointing out their God-chosen representatives (Numb. 11 : 16, 17, 25, 26; 1 Sam. 10 : 6, 10; 16 : 13), the whole body of disciples of Christ was pointed out as the people of God, according to the preintimation of Moses (Numb. 11 : 29); and the lesson of Pentecost is not that the Holy Spirit was given once for all to the Church, but that the Church was pointed out once for all, as the Israel of God, the fulness of Christ, and the one body to which God bore witness by all the spiritual gifts which had characterized the Old Testament people.

A time, in God's forbearance, was given to the people of the old economy to leave the fellowship of the Sanhedrin, and join themselves to the body of which the Apostles were the heads; and among them the Apostles were supernaturally preserved and directed to stand in the temple and preach to them "all the words of this life" (Acts 5 : 20). Thus, out of Israel, soon to perish as an outward community existing under the institutions

of Moses, a Church of Christ was built up, and into it, the Gentiles were brought as fellow citizens (Eph. 2 : 19).

It is this Church which is called "the Israel of God" (Gal. 6 : 16), Abraham's seed (3 : 29), the circumcision (Phil. 3 : 3), and every endearing term, and every endearing relation applied to the Old Testament people of God, is in the New Testament applied to believers in Christ. All that is merely Jewish is spoken of with something bordering on contempt. The ordinances of the law are carnal ordinances, established by a carnal commandment. They are weak and beggarly elements, and circumcision is a mere concision. Those who say they are Jews, are not, but do lie, and are of the synagogue of Satan (Rev. 3 : 9). Jerusalem becomes Sodom and Egypt, "where also our Lord was crucified" (11 : 8). In Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, and the doctrine of the Apostles is that Jews and Gentiles can find salvation in precisely the same way (Acts 15 : 11).

There is thus unity in both Testaments, and faith, not blood, is the uniting bond of the people of God. Those whom we may call Jews, cannot be said to have any race connection with the patriarchs; and if there were promises in the Bible to the physical seed of Abraham, it would be as difficult to find them, as to find the drops of the dew in the ocean.

Since the fall of the outward institutions of Moses, there may be a people who are the corporate successors of those opposed to Christ and his Apostles; and the Judaism into which the Early Church soon fell, and their acceptance of the Roman government as a theocratic power to defend and extend the faith of the Church, may have kept the persecuted synagogue comparatively free from intermixture with other peoples. The consequence may be that those whom we call Jews are in a great degree the pure descendants of the people to whom Christ came, and who are largely rationalistic in their faith, and accept neither Moses nor Jesus as God's messengers. Thus their separate existence can be accounted for, and no doubt it will continue, as long as there is anything like persecution of them, and so long as the Church continues to teach that God's promises are to a race, and that a race may have rights which

sacrifice time and pleasure, prejudice and money, that they may help him in his work and promote the advancement of the cause of God, in which they are as loyal as any man who ever wore the priestly robe.

Generally the majority of the men and women of every congregation, under all circumstances and at all times encourage their pastor.

In no social club, in no business relation, in no fraternal institution, can you find the friendship of David and Jonathan more literally exemplified, than in the bonds of love that unite the pastor to the majority of the men and women in his parish.

Even the discomforts of meager salaries are largely compensated for by the superior privileges, advantages and opportunities afforded to him and his family by the exalted position which the minister occupies.

Though he may not ride in so fine a turn-out or decorate his bosom with so costly a diamond, he can manage to get round over the city, for he generally has two good strong legs and he can walk; and he may carry with him a conscience void of offense, which is always an invaluable jewel that shines brighter than any crystal; and though his children may not be able to dress so in the height of style or indulge in all the silly, sickly talk about the latest fashion, the last theatre, the divine dance, or the lovely eucher-party, they can be respectably and neatly clad; and when a man or a woman, no matter how exalted in position or intellect, enters the humble parsonage parlor, they can engage in modest, intelligent conversation with either of them without blushing or stammering, on account of having devoted more training to their heels than to their brains.

By reason of his honored position and noble character, the city minister often enjoys the association and confidence of the acknowledged masters of the commercial and industrious enterprises of the world, and thus is able to bring his sons and daughters to their favorable notice. These men are quick to discern in minister's children those, who by their rigid practice in economy and honesty, and by their training in the recognition of the rights of men and the fear of God, have had in

Paul says: "I thank him that enabled me, even Christ Jesus, our Lord, for that he counted me faithful, appointing me to his ministry,"

Rutherford exclaims: "I think I would rather beg my bread, all the laboring days of the week, for an opportunity of publishing the gospel on the Lord's day, than, without that privilege, to enjoy the richest possessions on earth."

The man, called of God to proclaim the gospel to a lost world, who would leave the pulpit for the throne of Great Britain or for the presidency of the United States, would stoop.

He, whose arm is strong enough to support the weak, the song of whose voice can hush, if for but a moment, the sighings of distress, and whose heart can spare one chord from its own grief to throb responsively to the woes of others, has a calling that would not degrade an angel.

But to say that the regular work of the ministry has no discouraging features in it would be to claim angelic relationship too ethereal for most Lutheran preachers.

There *are* discouragements in the ministry; discouragements dependent no more upon the nature of the obstacles to be overcome than upon the nature of the man and the people with whom he deals.

Obstacles that throw some men into spasms of discouragement, serve other men only as a season of amusement. Some men can laugh out of countenance, opposition, that other men would either have to run away from or to knock down and drag out.

Some young ministers may have an honest contempt for Elijah's throwing himself in a fit of despondency under the soothing shades of that juniper tree, on account of the infuriated Jezebel; but they will not be in the ministry long until they learn from similar experiences to have lots of sympathy for Elijah, and that a real comforting effectual juniper tree would sometimes be "a consummation devoutly to be wished."

To be born in America, where the majority is supposed to rule, to be trained in the belief that all men are created free and equal, which is at least doubtful, educated in a college where free

thought and free speech and free research are the acme of privilege; with a heart and an intellect consecrated to God and eager for the advancement of his kingdom, possibly lacking in worldly wisdom and experience; to become the pastor of a church and for a few blessed short years to be fondled and petted and lionized by old and young, and then suddenly to find one's self confronted by one of those proud, haughty, indespensable rich men, who is self-made, and worships his maker, and assumes to own the preacher, and looks upon the church to which he belongs as his own little vest-pocket precinct, to do his bidding; or to run up against one of those little bullet-headed, stubborn, dictatorial autocrats or congregational bullies, whose own good will and pleasure are his only recognized law or conscience—such experiences soon render the preacher painfully conscious that there are discouragements in the ministry and that while he has a religion that reaches to the skies, it also stands on the ground, and for a good distance up its sides bears marks that indicate its contact with that which is of the earth earthy.

To an honest, energetic young man entering the ministry, the place of his pastorate, in many particulars, will make but little difference.

Some men will do all in their power, no matter whether they labor in the country or in the city. The amount of work to be done is mountainous, it is as wide as the human race and to such men, the amount of work accomplished is limited only by their own strength.

No doubt in a city pastorate, the amount of work that cannot be slighted or postponed or entirely set aside without detriment, is greater than in smaller places; and this essential work is dependent, not on the size of the congregation, but upon the size of the city. Cities have more in them of everything that is wicked and demoralizing, and they need more of everything that is good and uplifting.

In proportion to the expenses of living, the financial support of the city minister is far from being as good as that of those who labor in smaller places. Business, in the city, is much more intense and strictly exacting, and congregations are not

ministry. They long for larger libraries, but they have not yet read half of the books they already possess. They need more knowledge; but they cannot use all of the little knowledge they already have. To fly through the bounds of the universe and come back to the pulpit with crude knowledge, some of it real and some of it imaginative, some of it certain and some of it doubtful, would be most dangerous folly. They must select from what they know those things that will help men to live better, otherwise they may be good lecturers, but never good preachers.

To preach all the things that they have conned during the week, though they be true, might unsettle men's minds and send them to destruction. "Thou shalt command them to bring the pure olive oil, beaten, for the light to cause the lamp to burn always," is ever with the true minister, an unrepealed law.

Assuming, however, without farther attempting to express the high intellectual demands of the ministry, which may or may not be an encouragement, one is not allowed to labor in this field unmolested. The minister has an ever present enemy in himself.

The weakness of human nature is a fruitful source of many discouragements, which, though many a time conquered, phoenix-like, rise again.

The minister is especially liable to be tempted to a life of *Indolence.* Unlike in the other professions, in his calling, there is no strict surveillance of his time. His preparations for the service of the Sanctuary may be quite partial, but his people are kind and will pardon, and but few of them know how he has spent his time.

The attorney has his clients continually prompting his energy, by inquiring into the progress of their cases; the physician must visit his patients, or the report of his negligence will speed through the community and injure him in his profession. The business man must be at his office, day after day. But though the minister has great interests at stake and

God is bound to respect, no matter what its moral state may be. With all plainness of speech the Bible declares, that where the faith of Abraham is, there the children of Abraham are, and there are the heirs of the promises.

With such a faith, God's Israel must go forward, and realize that in all its activities Christ is in the midst, and goes forth with her missionaries "conquering and to conquer." Now as of old the Church's witnesses may have their baptism of blood to suffer, but its ultimate victory is certain, and under the cross as the symbol of our faith, the one family of God will continue to be constrained by the love of Christ, till the One body is completed and perfected, and Christ "shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied."

ARTICLE V.

THE DISCOURAGEMENTS AND ENCOURAGEMENTS OF A CITY PASTORATE.

By Rev. F. M. Porch, D. D.

Neither the subject of this paper, nor my experience will require the recital of anything striking or original. My ministry has had no unusual features. Our trials, we all have in common; our triumphs, we cannot deem worthy of record, but our difficulties we may mention for mutual profit, and our joys we may recount for inspiration and encouragement.

Ideally, perhaps there ought to be no discouragements to the minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He is a co-worker with God. We weary in well-doing and faint at times when we ought to rejoice as a strong man to run a race. The calling of the preacher is the noblest calling that God has ever been pleased to bestow upon human beings. The work of the Christian ministry is one that is much to be desired. It is as laudable, as honest, as noble and as delightful an ambition as ever was put before the minds of men.

their humble preacher's home, a schooling that in an unusual manner, has fitted them to occupy positions of honor and trust and emoluments—as is amply attested, by the fact that more such positions are occupied by ministers children as a class, than by those of any other profession. Thus the very disadvantages of the minister's children ripen into blessings to them.

Any how, if there is one thing in this world for which a man should be more grateful than for another, it is the poverty which necessitates his starting in life under great disadvantages. Poverty is one of the best tests of human quality in existence. A triumph over it is like graduating with honor from the first college of the land. A man who cannot stand this test is not good for anything; he can never rise above a drudge. If he cannot feel his will harden, as the yoke of poverty presses upon him, and his pluck rise with every difficulty that it throws in his way, he may as well retire from the race. Poverty saves a thousand times more people than it ruins, and it saves multitudes, whom wealth would destroy. If any of you are so unfortunate as to be rich, you have my sympathy. You lack one great stimulus to effort and excellence, which your poor companion possesses. You will have to be very careful and work very hard, or you will find yourself outstripped in the race of life by your poor companion, before you know it. It is a very common occurrence in the city, to find a man, who once was the hired man, now occupying the place of the proprietor. This also is encouraging, for it is none the less true, that for the humble, diligent minister, there is always the cheerful hand of hope, pointing to the open door entering into yet greater fields of usefulness.

The minister, indeed, has a personal, private life of his own in the sacred companionship of his wife and children, in whose culture and prosperity he must be especially interested. Their joys and sorrows mingle with his and play a large part in his life, and in them he finds those who most effectually and willingly enter into all his hopes and fears. But flowery beds of ease, gold and silver, honor and favor, either for himself or them are not the objects for which he lives and labors.

His work leads on from his home-life to his life as a public servant. In the midst of all his personal joys and anxieties, he must so conduct himself and be so taught of God in humility, cheeriness and hopefulness that he may be an acceptable herald of glad tidings and an efficient messenger of the word of reconciliation.

The *intellectual labors* of the minister are very numerous and very arduous. Like the constantly flowing waters of the rivers, they never pass by. The continual accumulation of material for his regular sermons and numerous speeches for all kinds of subjects and times and occasions is a perpetual source of anxiety. The men, whose brilliant, original, spontaneous thoughts clamor for expression are read about but seldom seen or heard.

The only thing in this world that comes without hard labor is poverty. You must grind or have no flour. Our audiences are not content with mere maxims and truisms. They can no longer be edified with holy groanings and pious platitudes. The demands upon the resources of the preacher are increasing as civilization increases; and the members of our congregations, after a man shall have preached before them for five or ten years, unless he is a constant, diligent student, are very apt to find out, what he ought to have found out a great while before, that his little pond is quite shallow, and are liable to take such steps and resort to such methods as will lead them by the side of fresh waters.

The work of collecting material from every quarter of the heavens above and the earth beneath and the waters under the earth, ranging more or less through every profession, science and calling, but so prepared as to be infused with moral feeling and applied to all the experiences of men within and to all the wants of men without: this is no trifling contract, but a very large and exhausting work; and there are multitudes of ministers to whom it is an anxious, honest thought every week: "Oh, What shall I preach about next Sunday? It seems to me that I have told, several times over, about all that I know."

Men simply falter before the gigantic mental labors of the

proverbial for the prompt payment of salaries, making it difficult for the average city minister always to meet his financial obligations, and that too in a place where a man's character is estimated, not by his professed piety, but by his ability promptly to pay his debts. No matter how honest or conscientious he may be, no matter how much others may be responsible for his empty purse, the minister's reputation and influence are damaged and may be ruined by unpaid bills.

The wise minister will resolutely, stubbornly and persistently avoid debt, as he avoids death, unless he is willing to invite a horrid spectre continually to dog his heels and possibly to be the assassin of his own happiness and reputation.

These things, though apparently trivial, will be found in many cases to be the principal, although, perhaps, the unacknowledged causes of pastoral removals. A preacher in a recent issue of his parish paper, was possibly more truthful than discreet in the following announcement:

"The pastor hereby announces that he has bought the Charles Slagel property, two doors north of the church. He will move the first of April. He has paid $50 of the price, and only has $2,050 to pay yet. I suppose by the time he gets the rest paid, his course will about be run in the congregation, and he will have to leave it. Such is the fate of all preachers, except some who have the courage to stay and fight and smell fire and brimstone."

But we have now walked far enough in the dark, to "let a little sunshine in." Fortunately there is another phase of ministerial life.

The history of the Church is a record of noble, heroic deeds, done by faithful, consecrated women, who are the minister's most sympathetic helpers, true as steel, ready at any time to parry a cruel criticism, to protect his good name, and like angels of light in many a dark hour, to cheer his heart by teaching him lessons of patience and trust.

Men there are also in every congregation, who love their pastor sincerely, who are ready to walk where he walks, and to suffer when he suffers, and with a benevolence born of God, to

many clients and patients depend upon him, yet they utter no remonstrance, they make no report of his negligence.

The minister has no office hours, no system apparent to the public and possibly no system apparent to himself. He is in danger of wasting many precious hours in indolence; in danger indeed of wasting his entire life work by lack of systematic study. When his best and most vigorous years are gone—and they fly exceedingly fast—he finds himself either without any mental capital or in the midst of a debris of information in which he has no system and over which he has no command.

> "Men have oft grown old among their books,
> To die, case-hardened in their ignorance,
> Whose careless youth had promised what long years
> Of unremitting labor ne'er performed."

If he escapes this danger and is made of that fiber of which men are made, then he is most certain to meet another equally dangerous difficulty—this time from without—and clad in the garb of an angel of light. Nearly all of the benevolent, charitable and Christian work in the city is done by our most busy and active men and women.

If the minister's labors cannot be checked, they may be sidetracked, if his energies cannot be wholly thwarted, they can at least be dissipated. There are so many attractions to the city minister; he is in such easy access to the ever alluring bookstores, public libraries and art-galleries; opportunities to hear the best public speakers and leading educators of the land and the most experienced servants of the Church—the court-house with its fiery eloquence and battles of words, together with the many calls on every hand, so many meetings to attend, so many committees to meet, so many public services to render, so much financial and general management of the Church to look after, the kaleidoscope constantly shifting, all tending to dissipation of energy, making the minister a machine running a little local universe of his own and almost a stranger to his study. When he does return, his hours of devotion, of prayer and of meditation are invaded by the everlasting pull of the bell, the servant climbing up several flights of stairs to impart

to him the monotonous information that there is a gentleman in the parlor, who wants to see the doctor, and who forgot to give his name or specify the object of his weighty mission. Of course, the doctor must go down, for who knows but it is some fellow who wants to get married; and most city ministers have conscientious scruples and constitutional limitations, that forbid them to allow such fish to slip between the meshes.

And when he meets the various callers, he finds himself confronted by all varieties of the *genus home*, from the nealty-clad and very respectful agent to the poor unfortunate, pleading for bread for his hungry wife and children. And somehow the true minister, no matter what his early nature may have been, finally comes to look tenderly upon all such people and to see in them gems that needs only the touch of God's Spirit to ally them with the angels and to make them heirs of God and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ; and therefore, precious time is easily consumed.

Often he must give a patient hearing to some one-eyed, halting stereoscopist, who has "the only enlightened and practical method of solving the evening service question and reaching the lapsed masses;" or to some poor, mistaken brother, who has a new scheme for redeeming the world in twenty-four hours; or who has been fore-ordained by a recent revelation to turn the world upside down, and wants to begin that work next Sunday morning in your pulpit—these are some of the specimens of ugly, outrageous bungling matters with which he is called upon to deal patiently, as they come and go, day by day, in the garb of angels of light.

Finally, late in the day, possibly late in the week, he begins the preparation of his sermon. As he sits in his study and at midday has not written a line because his thoughts will not flow, or when he burns his day's work because it is worthless, the minister looks out of the window and envies the workman, who, across the street, has completed, in the same time, so many feet of brick-work, which is as good as can be, and will last for many years, and then he returns to his desk discouraged because he cannot see the progress of his work, forgetful for the

time being that in all his work he must walk by faith and not by sight and that nothing done for God will come to naught.

But the sermon prepared for living beings must often be proclaimed to empty benches dotted here and there by the faithful few and the minister's power weakened before he begins by the feeling of "love's labor lost," because many of those for whom it was intended are not present.

This lecture must be original, at least in contrast with others of a similar character, which it has been my privilege to read, in this particular: I decline to discuss the comparative value of written and unwritten sermons. A certain minister was asked to preach to the prisoners in the Joliet Penitentiary, and was requested by the Warden not to preach on the Prodigal Son. "Why?" the minister asked. "Because" said the Warden, "by actual count the last seventeen preachers, who spoke to these prisoners, gave them the Prodigal Son and these poor fellows have about all of the Prodigal Son that they are able to stand." The minister concluded to be merciful and changed the topic.

For a similar reason I shall admit the value of both the written and the unwritten sermon. But the mere delivery of an address is very nerve-wasting and very debilitating. Some of the greatest divines that have occupied the pulpit in the past, such men as Drs. Bushnell, Channing, Robert Hall, Frederick Robertson and many other men of note—the delivery of a sermon that was charming to the audience kicked back and threw them on the ground in nervous exhaustion. A man may work all day long until he is so tired that he falls asleep, and not exhaust himself so much as the man does who uses the mind until his brain is excited and his vital force is expended, so that he cannot sleep, for brain-work is the hardest kind of work.

There are some men, whose ministrations, week by week, are a perpetual self-denial and sometimes border on the very edge of torture, as they labor night after night, toiling for hours, after other people are asleep, and outside of their own family and a few select friends, the only comfort and consolation, which they

get, is, "that fellow is no good. I heard him once, but if I ever get forgiven for it, I'll never hear him again."

There are few men in any rank of society, who work harder or longer than the average city minister. Two sermons a week, with all the incidental labors, would furnish employment enough, even in small churches for a pastor and an active assistant, and if the work of the ministry were a money-making institution, few ministers would be without their assistants. Clerical brains are the cheapest commodity in the market. The life of a clergyman is peculiar and unique and unless one is impelled by divine power, unendurable.

If any ordinary business man would exchange places with an ordinary minister they would probably both lessen the sum total of good accomplished and destroy their happiness and possibly shorten their lives.

The clergyman's life is a weary life, full of aches and pains and exasperations. He sees more of the under than of the upper side of human experience. If there is a skeleton in any family, it is generally exhibited, in all of its ghostly ghastliness, in his presence. If there is a feud in the neighborhood, it is generally brought to his attention.

The clergy are overworked and underpaid. They get a good deal of blame they do not deserve and not half the praise they do deserve.

I have made an effort to paint the discouragements of the ministry in flaming, but real colors, and without exaggeration.

But with a sufficient number of years of my life spent in the ministry to entitle me to at least the claim of an experience, I hesitate not to say, even in this presence, that personally and for personal selfish motives, I would never go into the ministry, if I could keep out of it.

I would not stay in the ministry, if I could get out of it.

But with the consciousness of divine guidance in my choice and life and of "woe be unto me if I preach not the gospel," the very elements in my nature, which I once thought disqualified me for the work of the ministry, have become my strongest sustaining forces; and the very trials of the ministry have be-

come an oriflamb, shining over my head and leading me with joy into the thickest of the fight. And with divine help all along the line—for he is never for a moment safe alone—with divine help, any honest, intelligent, consecrated man, called of God, having put his hand to the plow, can rejoice for the furrow already marked out, and for the seeds already sown, and for the harvests already gathered, and he need not look back until that day, when like Paul, whose very trials were among the causes of his rejoicing, he too can say :

"I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also, that love his appearing."

There never was a grander, holier or more delightful calling conferred upon mortal men, than the ministry of the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, but it must never be entered or continued for anything less or anything lower than the glory of God and the salvation and elevation of man.

Sometimes on Monday, the minister contrasts unfavorably his position intellectually with that of men in the other professions.

I have sometimes heard ministers tell how many thousands of dollars annually, they could have made if they had studied law. Ministers always make more money practicing law in their studies, than they would in their offices. If I had but a fraction of all the money, which I have made in my study by the machines which I have invented in imagination, but which never materialized, I would endow a college before the day closes.

I can easily understand the attractions of the legal profession and willingly accord due honor to the upright and high-minded lawyer, who is true to his calling. In his high vocation, he defends human rights against the treachery and villainy of wrong. As a peace-maker he mediates between angry disputants, and when the issue is inevitable, battles for principle and an impartial hearing for his client.

In the study and establishing of great principles, in the solution of vexed questions, the lawyer is engaged in a business that may well claim the energy and enthusiasm of any high-minded man.

But in all these respects the minister in his studies and in his labors may also rejoice. He too is concerned with human rights and human obligations, with the additional importance, that they belong to the soul's dignity and peace. He too is a jurist learned in law, but it is the eternal, unchanging law, which human legislators have not made and cannot annul, the law, whose seat is the bosom of God, whose voice is the harmony of the world.

In the administration of this law, the minister is the commissioned expounder and the authorized counsellor advising, adjusting and doing the gracious work of peacemaker between man and man and declaring peace between man and God.

As an advocate, he pleads in the forum of conscience and at the bar of God's mercy. Compared with the tribunals before which he pleads all others are insignificant; with the issues which he pursues, all the proceedings of earthly courts are trifles.

How worthy also of highest esteem, is the skilled and true physician. He deals with the maladies of the body; the minister with the maladies of the soul. Perhaps in no department of scientific investigation has there been more of laborious and patient research, than by the generous, high-minded physicians, who out of love for their profession and pity for suffering men, have persued their noble calling with heroic self-denial and often at the risk of life. And yet how little has been learned of diseases and their cure? But with the soul and its functions and diseases, the Christian minister is far more intimately acquainted, and the result is that notwithstanding all the obscurity of motives and differences of character, the frailties and maladies of the soul are known to the Christian divine. Sin he knows in all of its forms; and for remedies, he has the boundless store provided by the Great Master Physician and applied through repentance, faith and obedience, energized by the life-

giving Spirit of God. As a teacher, he ranks among the first educators of the world.

All wisdom and knowledge are included in that truth, which it is his vocation to impart. All human learning contributes to his great purpose.

Above most men, the teacher best knows the joys of imparting instruction; but the Christian teacher has the supreme joy of imparting eternal truths to men, of teaching the living word, which is able to make men wise unto salvation.

Wherein then lie the superior intellectual compensations of any other profession? For the joy of doing the work of the ministry, men have been content to live in deserts; to meditate in the dimness of mountain caves and beneath the pathetic loneliness of silent skies in order to catch the message of divine truth and peace and then come and pour it forth out of their impassioned hearts in strains of eloquence and warning. Such joy, such gladness, such encouragements belong to the minister's weary, unlauded, intellectual toil amid all the rush and intensity and material compensation of the busy, teeming life with which he is surrounded in the city.

The pulpit is the minister's throne. He deals with thoughts about which men are thinking. His soul kindles with rapture as he deals with truths that are heaven-born. He is conscious of divine assistance as he speaks of him, "who has raised up empires from their foundations, turned the stream of history from its old channel, and still continues to rule and guide the ages." In the solemnity of the occasion, in the earnest interest manifest, in the importance of the theme, in the joy that sees men made free, the minister, in the victories of the pulpit, has a coronation of encouragement, that throws a halo of joy upon all his trials and disappointments.

The pleasure and importance of the minister's work in the study and in the pulpit may be freely acknowledged but weakness or neglect in other departments would surely invite defeat. So much depends on the man himself that those who are efficient in tact and happy in personal endowments far outstrip the

intellectual giant or the pulpit orator. You cannot separate the sermon from the sermon-maker.

It is the man back of the sermon, more than any mental force or rhetorical finish or eloquent delivery that gives to the message its power over the listener. Many a preacher fails of success, not through any lack of intellect or oratory, but through lack of those elements of personal character, which are to the message what the powder is to the ball.

The field, therefore, has its defeats and victories no less renowned than the study and the pulpit. To perform the duties of the pastor, to meet successfully the unnumbered cases, problems and annoyances, that arise in his daily dealings with all classes of men and women, requires all the shrewdness of the lawyer, the trained skill of the physician, the tactics and authority of the general and the piety and patience of a saint. Knowing by intuition, when a certain person is going to be sick, aiding poor people in such a way as not to humiliate them, inculcating noble principles in families void of responsibilities, acting as a peacemaker between ill-mated husbands and wives, drumming up patrons for the sunday school and Church among children and careless, cold-hearted people, in all so acting as to bring men and women to Christ,—in short the work of the pastor alone is sufficiently large and important to employ all his waking hours and engage all his energy and wisdom.

And then in addition he must do the work of the general in getting his little church army so disciplined and suitably fed and supplied that they will convert his preaching into work and enable him to lead them in the assault upon the world. The terrific burden of the world's evangelization has been so trapped upon the shoulders of the clergy that it is almost impossible to get a sufficient number of men-workers to do anything, except to amble along admiringly by your side without getting enough exercise to keep their legs limber or their blood in good circulalion The work lying at the door of the city church can never be done by the ministers alone aided by a few faithful women; we need men-workers. The Church is the parish of the minister and the world is the parish of the Church, and the minis-

trations of the minister in his parish will avail according to the fidelity of the Church in its parish. "If the fires of persecution were kindled again, as they were in the early centuries, there would no doubt be many Luthers and Cranmers and Husses, Peters, Pauls and Stephens; but some, it is to be feared, would hide their lights under a bushel rather than make light by their quivering burning flesh."

In view of the enemies, that are not imaginary but actual and terribly real, that are to be overcome, the city minister sees the necessity of obedience to the divine injunction: "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil, for we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

The city minister lives on the battlefield. He is never beyond the roar of clashing arms and the groans of the suffering and dying.

The city is the heart of the land—it is the fountain of life or death. It is the Gettysburg or the Waterloo of the world's conflict. "If the Lord keep not the city," the day is lost, the dye is cast, the doom is sealed.

What goes on in the city gives color and tone to the actions and persuits of men. The intense business activity that drives men like beasts of burden every working day of the week makes them too tired to spend the Sabbath day in the Sanctuary, and the worldly greed that blinds men to all, except to what adds to wealth and pleasure, destroys all appetite for spiritual thinking.

The group of abominations which I can only enumerate—Sabbath desecration, the Sunday newspaper, the saloon, the brothel, the low theatre, the gambling dens, sweep away thousands, who never enter the church doors.

The classics tell us of a lake, called Avernus—or birdless—located in the crater of an extinct volcano. From its foul depths exudes a gas, which with infernal power fills the atmos-

phere above and around the lake with a poison so deadly, that any bird, from the kingly eagle to the silver-throated nightingale, attempting to cross it, is stupefied, and notwithstanding its struggle for life, eventually is cast down to the dark waters and engulfed with the thousands, who have gone before into its never satisfied depths of death. Thousands of men, like "these birds of passage" find these abominations of the city to be a lake Avernus, into whose depths they sink, never to rise again.

The great foreign elements,—many of whom are among our noblest and most worthy citizens,—have their headquarters in our cities and in many instances constitute the large majority of our populations. Among these are found the enemies of the American Sabbath, the sworn foes of law and order, and Atheism as daring and defiant and reckless as marked the godless era of the French Revolution.

Romanism, proud, ponderous, impenetrable, unfeeling and towering in its ancient strength and defiant in its clandestine machinations, like an immense deadweight crushes down upon the cities and dictates their government and is the subtle adversary of every effort to ameliorate the conditions of the people and redeem the cities from the hands of corruption and fraud.

Of the corrupt political rings that dominate our cities, a writer whose book is a classic on sociological questions, says: "Who are they? They are gamblers, saloon-keepers, pugilists or worse, who have made a trade of controlling votes and of buying and selling offices, and though they toil not, neither do they spin, they wear the best raiments and spend money lavishly." Organized wrong standing apparently irresistible against unorganized right.

Another great difficulty to be met comes from the very prosperity of the city along with which rises a spirit of discontent among the poor, fostered by the sharp contrasts of the city life and driving them into organizations and labor unions that take the place of the Church. The city by parading its wealth accentuates poverty. Nowhere else is poverty so keenly felt. To the rich man the streets of the city are sympathetic; to the

poor man, their boisterous and arrogant display of wealth awakens the spirit of rebellion.

Phillips Brooks says: "This city poor man is no lay figure for a sermon. He is real. You meet him every day. His is the face that looks moodily at you as you hurry by him on the sidewalk or throw the street's mud from your carriage wheels upon his coat. His is the hand that rings your door-bell in the dusk, and his is the voice that whines and cringes to you in your hall, and curses you as he goes down your steps, with the memory of your glowing wealth before his eyes, and your quiet assurance that you have no money to give him in his ears, and the leaden load of wretchedness heavier than ever, at his heart."

We keep expecting these poor people to throng our churches, we ring our bells, and post our placards, and advertise our services, emblazon our windows, carpet our aisles, put a dash of the opera in our music and a suspicion of the theatre in our preaching, promise them free pews and guarantee no collections; but all that is cheap bait, wherewith to tempt into our churches, one whose hopeless poverty is brought out all the more flagrantly by the ease and comfort of those whom he sees around him, possibly among them those, who on Sunday may know him by name as they welcome him to the church, but during the week, know him only by the number on a block as he goes like a galley-slave to his daily toil.

The difficulty of meeting such people is surpassed only by that of meeting those who make up the other end of the extreme, our very wealthy class, who live in careless luxury and pompous pride.

We laud the devotees of the Salvation Army, who carry the gospel to the people in the slums, and they may be worthy of all the honor bestowed upon them. But it takes a braver man, a more consecrated and a holier man, on a similar mission, to mount the steps of the great brown stone fronts and knock on the massive, carved doors of the haughty, self-satisfied rich man, who, in many instances, is as ignorant of and as antagonistic to the Gospel of Jesus Christ and its great principles of

love to God and man, as the poor black man that courtsies in obeisance at his feet and begs for bread at his kitchen door.

Thus the city minister strikes the waves with his single oar, but apparently scarcely changes so much as a ripple on the boisterous surface of the mighty deep. His lonelines is oppressive. His public services are but a few hours each week; though he be surrounded by hundreds of thousands of his fellows yet

The victims of Avernus seldom come within the limits of his orbit.

The great foreign population are either anti-church or have churches of their own preference.

The Romans are hemmed in, wall upon wall, by prejudice and ignorance.

The hordes of hopeless poor; the proud processions of luxurious wealth—these, constituting almost the entire population of the city, are apparently beyond his reach; many of the remainder have their homes in other churches, so that his constituency, though apparently a city full, are actually but a few hundred; and of these many are attracted by taller steeples and more eloquent preachers so that the size of his audiences is often surpassed by that of those in the smallest country village.

When one undertakes to summarize the discouragements of the city pastor, he is in danger of making himself liable to the charge of pessimism, and of having his sense of responsibilities blunted by the multiplicity of problems and perils with which he is confronted.

> "The ocean is very great and our boats are very small,
> Why set out to sea at all?

When he thinks of all the evils and opposing forces, of the many problems, with the solution of which he has to do, he is liable to be overcome with the impression: "And I, even I only, am left, and they seek my life to take it away," and to forget that there are "seven thousand in Israel, who have not bowed the knee to Baal."

The minister, however, is not alone. He is in a goodly company.

"Where sin doth abound, grace doth much more abound."

His gentle smile upon the child, his friendly talk with the young man on the street, his earnest conversation with the man in the office, his appeal to the unsaved, these are spoken of in the homes of the rich and the poor alike, with gratitude as rays of sunshine, coming through the rift of the clouds of every-day life. The ties formed at christening, the friendships linked at marriage-feasts, the sympathy expressed in the sick chamber, the comfort in the hour of affliction, the councils given at com munion seasons, are generally seeds sown in good and honest hearts, that bring forth fruits of affection and love that shall be a joy forever.

His contact with the brighest and most active minds gives him a keen desire for greater efficiency. Opportunities for doing good meet him wherever he goes and the stirring activities with which he is surrounded catch him in the whirl and inspire him to greater diligence as a workman that needeth not to be ashamed. In his congregations are more intelligent men and women so that even if the average intelligence is no higher than usual, he feels the spur of efforts in his pulpit ministrations. The great work to be done is so commanding and conspicuous, that men more easily recognize their responsibilities and come more quickly to his aid and thus greater things are undertaken for the Master, and money flows freely into the channels of righteousness. Earnest consecration is never more beautiful than that found in the cities.

The many refining, educational, charitable, moral and religious organizations help to manufacture and sustain the unseen, untrumpeted, but resistless moral force in the city, that more than any laws, more than any penalties, more than any police force, stands like an angel of power hovering over the city, before which the demons of humanity stand in fear.

So that though the city minister sees many discouragements. and his head is often bowed in sorrow, and his heart saddened by the careless indifference of those whom he loves, and his message is spurned by the maddening crowds that rush by him, yet the good soldier most delights to be in the front line, in the thickest of the fight, that shall settle the destiny of nations,

So the city minister rejoices in the privilege of having a place, however lowly, in the very storm-centre of modern civilization, where the battle of the age is being fought to the finish. *It is grand to be at the post of danger.* A brave, hopeful, consecrated, courageous, faithful man, counts it all joy to stand in the place of greatest responsibility.

But the most inspiring encouragement, the supreme joy, the crowning hope of the minister anywhere lies in that department of his work, into which the limits of this subject do not require me to enter.

Our hope is in God, and in his gospel of Jesus Christ, and in his precious promises to all those, who are faithful and valiant in his service; and who, in the making of the kingdoms of this world to become the kingdoms of our Lord, "has chosen the foolish things of this world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty, and base things of the world and things which are despised, and things which are not, to bring to naught things that are; who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of aliens."

Professor Tyndal says: "I have seen wild stone avalanches of the Alps which smoke and thunder down declivities sufficient to stun the beholder; yet, to produce enough snow-flakes for a child to carry, has required an energy competent to lift up these shattered blocks and pitch them to twice the height from which they fell." This power is ours, as well as the source of all our glorious history.

It enabled twelve men, with no equipments save the gospel, with no arms and no armies, no royal aid and no learning, no wealth, no power of any kind, as men count power, to fling themselves as an infant of days against all opposition until heathenism, Judaism and imperial Rome fell before its victorious march.

This power still energizes the words of the humblest man of

God and can overturn all opposition and accomplish marvels, at which earth's proud hordes shall stand in awe.

Witness the almost unknown monk, and see how out of his words were brought modern civilization and all its blessings.

Go yonder to Erfurt,—enter the cloister of its monastery,—where Luther is pouring over the word of God.

Afflicted and sad, he has written the walls over with verses—some desponding, some hopeful. A pious old monk, whose own heart has had such trials, whispers to him: "The just shall live by faith." As he looks at the promise, God sets his soul free.

His sickness vanishes; and his soul rises to joy, and he goes forth a strong man to battle with the monster, sin. And in his battling, he writes down his view of his faith. Luther dies. 200 years pass. Go to London. Up that little street, so narrow that a wagon can hardly pass, in a little room there is a company of praying men and women, unknown to fame; an Oxford collegian, who has been to America to preach the gospel, comes into the midst of them and sits down. One of them takes up the commentaries of Luther and reads the preface to Romans; that young collegian follows the reading, and, as he is listening, he says: "My heart was strangely warmed; I too felt that Christ loved even me;" and Wesley went forth and gathered such men as Whitefield and Asbury and men whose names have become historic, to preach the gospel in two continents, and the children of Luther and the children of Wesley have sung that gospel around the world and lifted its light upon the dark places of all nations.

Thousands of others have been blessed by these writings of Luther; and thousands have felt the impress of the burning thoughts that cluster around the great passage, "The just shall live by faith."

What did all this? It was the power of God, turning into eternal fruition the words of the lowly and almost unknown monk. It was the very same power they had at Pentecost,—the source of all our hope and without which our labors are vain.

ARTICLE VI.

ASCETICISM: ITS PLACE IN CHRISTIAN CONDUCT.

By Rev. G. U. Wenner, D. D.

The subject is not antiquated. It is related to the Christian life of every age; to that of the Twentieth Century as truly as to that of the Middle Ages. It has first of all a personal interest, as a means of sanctification and a help to the holy life. The busy age in which we live is not congenial to its demands. We have much to do. But this great work which we have to do, in which we glory, or under which we groan, as the case may be, may itself become a temptation of Satan. Of what use are all his promised kingdoms if that one little realm, our own heart is an unknown territory, or is not in all its provinces subject to the King?

The word is older than Christianity. Originally used for the training which athletes had to undergo, it came to be applied by the Stoics to the gymnastics of the soul. Through them it came into Christian thought and practice in the early ages. For many centuries it held undisputed sway over the conscience, and it is still an element that has to be reckoned with by Christian teachers, Romish, Protestant and Episcopalian.

From the purely ethical standpoint asceticism consists in the performance of such acts and the observance of such rules as will lead to moral perfection. Moral perfection is the goal to be reached. Ascetic acts are the means by which men are fitted and strengthened to attain the goal. In classic usage gymnastic and agonistic are used as synonyms of ascetic.

As applied to the religious life acts of asceticism may be divided into two classes, the sensuous and the spiritual, or the somatic and the psychic, the negative and the positive. To the first class belong the forms which proceed from the sensuous life, acts of mortification and self-denial. To the second class belong acts in which the spiritual life takes the initiative and

operates constructively and positively on ourselves and on the world around us, with reference to the upbuilding of the kingdom of God. To this class belong acts of worship, the practice of industry, patience, humility, and so forth.

In the earliest ages of Christianity, down to the beginning of the 4th century, ascetic prescriptions, such as related to fasting and the hours of prayer were observed in fullest harmony with the freedom of the gospel. "Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving," were marks of heretical sects whose views derived their inspiration from heathenism. The Christian principle was: "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer."

From the 4th to the 7th centuries we find a remarkable development of nearly all the chief forms of asceticism, both of the positive or psychical kind, such as observance of hours of prayer, reading the Bible, taking the sacrament, works of charity and the like, as also of the negative or somatic kind such as the infliction of pain upon the body. St. Simeon of the pillar, who died in 460, belongs to the beginning of this period. You remember Tennyson's description:

> But yet
> Bethink thee, Lord, while thou and all the saints
> Enjoy themselves in heaven, and men on earth
> House in the shade of comfortable roofs,
> Sit with their wives by fires, eat wholesome food,
> And wear warm clothes, and even beasts have stalls,
> I, 'tween the spring and downfall of the light,
> Bow down one thousand and two hundred times,
> To Christ, the Virgin Mother, and the Saints;
> Or in the night, after a little sleep,
> I wake: the chill stars sparkle; I am wet
> With drenching dews, or stiff with crackling frost.
> I wear an undressed goat-skin on my back;
> A grazing iron collar grinds my neck;
> And in my weak, lean arms I lift the cross,
> And strive and wrestle with thee till I die.

The Middle Ages, from the seventh to the sixteenth century,

from Gregory the Great to Martin Luther, include the thousand years in which the Roman Church held and trained the Germanic races under the sceptre of the popes. Protest as we may against many of their methods, it cannot be denied that they worked-over immense masses of people into some semblance of Christianity. And one of the most potent factors in this process was asceticism. The masses were impressed with the nature of sin and the necessity of penitence, and by their acts of penance were brought into relations of obedience to the demands of the Church.

Among the most remarkable forms of asceticism was that of self-flagellation. For centuries it held sway. Processions of penitents went from city to city in all of Western Europe and sang their doleful Kyries while inflicting upon themselves cruel tortures. It included among its votaries a king of France and an emperor of Germany, and there is no more pathetic story than that of the sufferings of Elizabeth of Hungary at the hands of Conrad of Marburg.

Henry Suso is a representative of the poet mystics of the Middle Ages. He was born in 1295. With a passionate longing to suffer with Christ the pains of the cross, he in his eighteenth year made for himself a wooden cross in length and breadth fitted to his body. Into this cross he drove thirty nails, and day and night he carried it upon his back for eight years. Then he inserted seven sharp needles which pierced his flesh. The pain was so great that he dulled the points of the needles somewhat, but afterwards, ashamed of his unmanly cowardice, he sharpened them again so that the slightest movement inflicted on him sharp pain and the blood flowed. To make the burden more tolerable he carved on the back of the cross the name of Jesus. Every day he engaged in two exercises, which consisted in his pounding on the cross in such a way that the nails pierced his flesh and could only be withdrawn with his garments. This he did secretly and unobserved. The first exercise took place at the pillar of flagellation and there he prayed that Christ might with his wounds heal his own. The second exercise took place at the foot of the cross of Christ and there

he prayed that he might be nailed to Christ and might never be separated from him. On special days he engaged in three exercises, and once having inadvertently touched the hands of two girls who sat near him in church, he underwent thirty exercises. Besided this he engaged in self-flagellation, carried an iron chair, and wore an undergarment furnished with 150 sharp brass nails that constantly tore his flesh. On his breast he carved the letters IHS and renewed them from time to time. These and many other modes of self-torture he endured for 22 years, from his eighteenth to his fortieth year, when for conscientious reasons he ceased the further infliction of torture. And yet at the end of this time, and during the entire period, his soul was filled with the sweetness of divine grace and his writings abound with the testimony of his close fellowship with God. Five hundred years later these writings were published, and one cannot avoid the feeling that, distorted as was the thought of Suso, the Lord himself recognized the service rendered in an age of barbarous sensuality as a testimony to that statement of St. Paul which is fundamentally true in all the ages: "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts."

We come to review its place in the history of Protestant churches. Luther, with his ideas of justification by faith and of the freedom of the Christian man, had little use for asceticism in his doctrinal system, although personally he practiced many of its principles. He was known to spend three hours a day in prayer. And in his catechism he says; "fasting andthe preparation of the body are indeed a good external discipline but he is truly worthy and well prepared (to receive the Lord's Supper) who believes these words given and shed for you for the remission of sins." But it was through Melanchthon, the pedagogue, the Preceptor of Germany, that the ascetic ideas found a place in the symbols. They are placed under the *Tertius Usus* of the law, the law as a school-master.

The Reformed trend of Protestantism retained several ascetic features. The Episcopal type recommends at certain intervals seasons of what the Lutherans called discriminations in foods,

and it has also had a great influence in the social observance of what is popularly called Lent. This season in society, which formerly consisted of forty days, a theatrical manager recently declared has now been reduced to two, Ash Wednesday and Good Friday. The Puritans have given as their contribution to the ascetic life of Protestantism, the observance of the Lord's Day as a Sabbath, and the establishment of Fast Day. But if a recent proclamation of a New Hampshire governor is to be believed, the fast has become a feast. The Reformed Presbyterians prescribe fasting as a *sine qua non* for the Lord's Supper.

Among Protestants, the nearest approach to the ascetic life has been made by the Methodist society. The very name points to the thing. The members of their churches are forbidden to dance, to play cards to attend the circus or the theater. Those who do these things, it is ordered by their discipline shall be expelled if after due admonition there be no sign of real humiliation.

The sections of the Methodist discipline relating to ministers prescribe questions of the most searching kind in relation to their daily conduct:

"Do you use as much fasting and abstinence every week as your health, strength and labor will permit? Do you deny yourself every useless pleasure of sense? Do you use only that kind and degree of food which is best both for body and soul? Do you eat no more at each meal than is necessary? Do you choose and use water for your common drink? Wherein do you take up your cross daily?

There are also some restrictions in the matter of smoking.

It will thus be seen that so far as negative or somatic asceticism is concerned the Methodist rules are a close copy of the principles of monastic regulations. And in regard to spiritual exercises the rules are equally strict. There must be set times for rising, reading the Bible, meditation and prayer. There are rules in regard to conversation and social relations in general. Many of these things we could not approve. They appear somewhat legalistic. Certainly to an ease-loving generation they must frequently prove irksome. But does it not seem

that God has greatly blessed the people who so resolutely took up their cross of self-denial? A recent encyclical of their bishops calls attention to some of the needs of their church. If there has been a loss of world-conquering power among Methodists, may it not be owing to some extent at least to the relaxation of the discipline which characterized the epigons of their church.

The ascetic trend of the Methodist church is seen also in the name which they give to their religious services. They call them "exercises," *exercitia spiritualia*, that is drill, or spiritual gymnastics. The term is now so commonly used that one needs to be reminded of its etymology to appreciate its real significance.

To the Methodists also we are indebted for the practice of kneeling in prayer. The Lutherans, in harmony with the early church, prescribe standing, excepting in acts of penitence, while the Reformed churches repudiate all attidutinarianism in devotional acts.

It thus appears that apart from certain schools or tendencies there are few traces of asceticism in Protestant church-life. In the Christian Endeavor Society we have a revival of the vow or pledge, and the members of the Tenth Legion devote a definite portion of their income to the purposes of religion. At a recent Northfield meeting an inquisition was attempted in regard to the length of time which the ministers spent in prayer but the effort threw a coldness over the meeting. Occasionally spasmodic efforts are made to imitate Episcopalian practices. But it must be evident to even a superficial observer that asceticism as a principle has but a slight hold on the Protestant conscience and that its import is either not known, or else is intelligently repudiated.

In other words, the performance of outward acts and the observance of arbitrary rules for the purpose of self-discipline and the attainment of a higher life take but a small place in our pastoral theology.

Nevertheless in view of the prominent place which this subject has held in the history of the Church and its constant re-

curence to the consciences of men we must be ready to give an answer to the question: Has asceticism a place in Christian conduct?

The answer is found in the very nature of man. Our old nature does not leave us in the moment of regeneration. Like Sinbad the Sailor's old man of the sea, the old Adam has flung his legs around us with tenacious grip. The Christian life is a conflict between the old man and the new. Regeneration is not sanctification. The sarx has not yet been destroyed. The regenerate man has indeed a new spirit which delights in the law of God. But the law in the members promptly takes up the challenge which is thrown down nor will it ever lose its vitality so long as we run in the race of this earthly life.

Hence this psycho-somatic nature of ours has to be kept in check, and as St. Paul directs, we must pummel it and lead it along like a slave.

This has nothing to do with that Pharisaic spirit which beholds in the performance of outward acts an offering acceptable to God, and which has held so many, and not merely those of the Middle Ages, in spiritual bondage. Every creature of God is good, and as Luther says, in reference to acts of self-mortification: "God is not a murderer like the devil, whose object is to make the salvation-by-works people fast and pray and vigilate themselves to death." But it does imply a recognition of the fact that in the new covenant as in the old, in the establishment of the kingdom of God in the world as well as in their personal relation to that kingdom the people of God are called to engage in a holy war. "Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel; for as a prince has thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed."

Because a Christian is never a result but always a process, as Luther says, it is incumbent upon him to watch and struggle continually against the powers of evil that surround him. There is no swifter or more well-trodden way to spiritual death than simply to let things drive, to live an easy life without subjecting one's self to the discipline and restraint of the order to which we belong.

The practice of ascetic acts, is, it is true largely a personal question, one that every one must decide for himself. And we may admit with Rothe that the less a man needs them, the better he is off. Still, the practice of daily self-examination and particularly prior to the reception of the Lord's Supper would be wholesome. So too the stated reading of Scriptures, the use of manuals of devotion, the imposition of *silentium* upon a tongue that wags too freely, the confession of faults to some Christian friend, or to some father or mother confessor might help to restore to normal strength many a flabby Christian.

In the Protestant system acts of asceticism are to be used for a certain purpose, as means, and when they are no longer needed they may be omitted. They have no absolute value in themselves. Acts of faith only have a moral value, as Schleiermacher has well said.

But the question has a much wider reach. It stretches into the entire view of life, and it is not saying too much that it includes the fundamental conception of our duty to God and our relation to the world. It is the question whether Christian conduct in its deepest impulses means a renunciation of the world or merely a subjugation of the world. I do not mean the world in the narrow sense, in which it is declared to be not a friend of God, but the world in a wider sense, this present life with all that it contains and offers, as contrasted with the kingdom of God both in its heavenly and earthly manifestations. Should we sing "I'm a pilgrim and I'm a stranger," and should we keep our eyes fixed on the heavenly Jerusalem, or should we live in the world and for the world as for something that is itself destined to be the kingdom of God. Rothe was the great apostle of this latter doctrine and he has been followed to a great extent by the liberal theologians of our day.

Kaftan it is true concedes that Christianity has a mystic side *renouncing* the world, as well as an ethical side which *embraces* the world. But Ritschl declares that renunciation of the world is allowable only in so far as it is necessary to overcome the world. It is peculiar to Protestantism, he says in his history of Pietism, to regard Christianity not as a fleeing from the world

but as filling and permeating the world. As opposed to the pietistic and monastic spirit, he regards Christian perfection as consisting in the fulfilment of ones calling. According to Hermann a Christian finds eternal good right here in the midst of this present life and not outside of it. We are dead to the world when we make a proper use of it, that is when we control it. But captivating as these words are, and calculated to win the applause of all who like Demas have loved this present world, and recognizing too that they give the key-note to much of the pulpit utterance of modern times, they do not represent the confession of the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints. Rather would I live in the atmosphere of a Kempis a Tersteegen and a Wesley, than to breathe the balmiest airs of this earthly Paradise. They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. They are *in* the world but they are not *of* it. The center of their being is not on earth but in heaven.

The Son of God goes forth to war,
  A kingly crown to gain;
His blood-red banner streams afar,
  Who follows in his train?
Who best can drink his cup of woe, triumphant over pain;
  Who patient bears his cross below, he follows in his train.
A noble army—men and boys, the matron and the maid;
  Around the Saviour's throne rejoice, in robes of light arrayed
They climbed the steep ascent of heaven through peril, toil and pain:
  Oh God, to us may grace be given to follow in their train.

ARTICLE VII.

JESUS WITH THE DOCTORS.

LUKE 9 : 41–52.

By Rev. R. B. Peery, Ph. D.

Wonderful are the silences of Scripture. If many things revealed to us in God's holy word are strange, some things that are not revealed are hardly less strange. Doubtless we have all been impressed, in reading our Bibles, by the things that are passed over in silence. As we read about certain incidents we feel that something we have long desired to know may now be made plain to us; but when we approach the crucial point our curiosity is not gratified—the inspired penman has left unwritten what we hoped to find there. Alexander Maclaren has said that these silences of Scripture are as eloquent as its speech.

Recall some examples of these strange silences. We read in 2 Cor. 12 : 2–4 that St. Paul was caught up even to the third heaven, into Paradise, and that he there heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter. Have we not often wondered what those unspeakable words were?

Again, in John 8 : 3–8 we read that when the Pharisees brought the woman taken in adultery to Jesus and accused her before him he stooped down and wrote with his finger in the sand. Then raising his tender eyes, he gave permission for those who were without sin among them to cast the first stone at her—for according to Moses' law such a woman should be stoned to death. Again stooping down he continued writing in the sand. What words did our Master write? This is the only time the Scriptures speak of Jesus as having written anything, and the words he wrote are not recorded in the Book.

When our blessed Lord was crucified between two thieves we know that one of them, repenting of his sins, turned to Jesus in that last dark hour, and prayed, "Lord, remember me when

thou comest in thy kingdom." And Jesus forgetting his pain, replied graciously, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Paradise! That home of the departed soul! The place where the spirits of our sainted dead are gone! What is it? Is it the final heaven? or is it a resting place this side of the goal? Oh that Jesus had on this occasion uttered just a few words about that Paradise to which we are all swiftly going! But the sacred lips were closed, and the knowledge is sealed to us this side of the grave.

The last verse of the last chapter of John is a wonderful verse. After recording all the strange sweet things that Jesus said and did during his remarkable life, the beloved disciple tells us, "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written." What were some of these "other things"? We can never know.

But most wonderful of all the wonderful silences of Scripture is that about the childhood and young manhood of Jesus. We are told about his miraculous conception, about the birth in Bethlehem, the visit of the wise men, the presentation in the temple, the flight into Egypt, and the return to Nazareth; and then a curtain falls over the life of the Christ-child, effectually hiding him from our view.

The loving heart naturally inquires about that early life in Nazareth. We would like to know something of his home life, who were his playmates, what games he played, who were his teachers. But God has hidden all these things from us, and for good reason. Our judgment as to the relative value of things is so often in error; we are so apt to let that which is near and intelligible to us occupy our minds to the exclusion of things that are farther away and more difficult of comprehension, no matter how important they may be. If we know of the daily life of the child Jesus we would pay too much attention to it. Do we not see in the apocryphal books of the Bible to what extremes this tendency of our nature leads men? The first thirty years of Jesus' life were but preparatory—his work was to

come after. By passing over these thirty years in silence the inspired apostles would direct our minds exclusively to that which is all-important in him. It is well that we do not know the details of the early life of our Lord.

But the curtain which conceals from our curious view that sacred home was once drawn aside, and we see Jesus at twelve years of age going up with Joseph and Mary to the Paschal Feast at Jerusalem. How thankful we are for this one incident! It throws a bright light upon the whole period, and by it the imagination is able to reconstruct in large part the child-life of Jesus.

I have sat in my room on the hillside in Nagasaki on a dark night, and looked out upon the city and harbor, when the beautiful hills were wrapped in thick darkness, and nothing was visible but the myriad lights in the city and on the shipping in the harbor. Suddenly there flashed out from one of those mighty men-of war a powerful search-light, which threw its brilliant rays far into the dark hills and made them light as day. In an instant it was gone, and all was shrouded in black darkness again. This visit of Jesus to Jerusalem at twelve years of age is a search-light, giving us a momentary glimpse of his whole early life.

We will look closely into this first conscious visit of Jesus to Jerusalem.

The men of Judea and Galilee were required to go up to Jerusalem three times per year, to attend the three great feasts. Women were not compelled to go; neither was it customary for them to do so. From the fact that Mary was wont to accompany her husband to the feasts we would infer that she was a deeply religious woman, to whose devout soul those sacred ceremonies afforded great comfort and satisfaction. Children were thought to reach a period of accountability at twelve years of age, and were required to present themselves in Jerusalem at that time. They then became "children of the law," and had a personal responsibility in connection with the national religion. In compliance with this requirement, the little lad Jesus now

went up with his mother and Joseph to Jerusalem for the first time.

Let us try to picture the procession. It is the joyous spring-time. Many men and some women and children are going up to the nation's capital. All work is laid aside, and mirth and rejoicing prevail. The pilgrims are dressed in their best robes, and are full of glad anticipation of the coming feast. And so they set out by foot on the long journey of sixty or seventy miles to Jerusalem. The men would naturally drift together; the women would form little companies of their own; and the happy children would play in bands by the way. And thus, laughing and shouting, and especially singing those grand old "songs of ascent" they slowly wended their way over high hill and verdant vale towards the sacred city.

What were the emotions of Jesus on this, his first conscious visit to Jerusalem? His childhood had been spent among the quiet pastoral scenes of Galilee, and in the little hamlet of Nazareth. Now he was going to see for the first time a great city. My childhood and youth were spent in a quiet country home, and I never saw a large town until I was almost a young man. Well do I remember the day when at sixteen years of age my father took me with him to Baltimore, and I had my first sight of a large city, with its countless houses and thronging multitudes. Is it irreverent to suppose that some such feeling filled the breast of the lad Jesus, as he made his first visit to a large city?

But this journey meant far more than that to him. He was going up to the city of his fathers, the center of the religious associations and memories of the Jewish race. We know from his later life that he was thoroughly conversant with Jewish history. He knew all the wonderful events that had occurred in this city of David and Solomon. He knew all the hallowed associations that clustered around that sacred spot. And I think these thoughts must have been uppermost in his mind as he drew near to Jerusalem on that bright spring morning. Doubtless in glad anticipation he repeated oft on this journey the Psalmist's words: "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us

go into the house of the Lord; our feet shall stand within thy gates, Oh Jerusalem." Perhaps as he came to the summit of Olivet and caught his first glimpse of the magnificent city his heart involuntarily exclaimed: "Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth is Mount Zion."

And what must his feelings have been as he entered the great city, and began the ascent of Mount Moriah! Raising his eyes, he would see on the summit the splendid temple, a mountain of marble and gold, glittering in the sunlight. The temple had been rebuilt on a grand scale by Herod. So large were its proportions that 200,000 people could find standing room in it at one time. The slabs of marble that made its walls were of enormous size; while the ornamentation of gold and silver was beautiful beyond comparison. But more than its outward beauty was the inner meaning of the temple to Jesus. To him it was the local center of the religion of Jehovah; the place where the presence of God dwelt; where had hovered the cherubin and seraphim; and where had burned the sacred fire on the altar. His heart overflowing with these emotions, he went in with his earthly parents to do after the manner of the feast.

The sacrifices, the gorgeous ritual, the brilliant robes, the grave, gray-bearded priests, must have made a deep impression upon his youthful mind. We know not when the consciousness of his Messiahship first dawned in the mind of Jesus. There are many who think that he was aware of his great mission from early childhood; while there are others who think that this consciousness did not come until the time of his baptism by John in the Jordan. But it seems highly probable that here in the holy temple this great idea first dawned in the mind of our Saviour. His childhood had doubtless been quiet and uneventful; and there had perhaps been little to call forth latent ideas and powers. But now he was in the sacred temple; its hallowed memories were crowding on his mind; its brilliant ceremonies were before his eyes. May it not well have been that as a natural rebound to all these influences there sprang up in his consciousness the idea that he himself was the one whom all this typified, the long-looked-for Messiah?

When Joseph and Mary had fulfilled the days they started on the homeward journey, and the boy Jesus tarried behind in Jerusalem. Although the feast lasted seven days, pilgrims from the provinces were permitted to return at the end of the second day, and it is most likely that Joseph and Mary returned at that time. The doctors would hardly have been accessible to Jesus after the seven days were past. It was quite natural that the parents of Jesus should leave the city without enquiring if he was with them, for he was a big boy now, and had always shown himself worthy of their trust and confidence. They supposed that he was somewhere in their company. Jesus himself was absorbed by the contemplation of the things of the temple, and without any thought of disrespect had remained behind "in his Father's house." Perhaps he was not even aware that his mother had gone.

It was customary on these feast days for some of the scribes to go out in the porch of the temple, and instruct the people in the law by familiar conversation with question and answer. To one of these little parties Jesus drew near, and listened with rapt attention. By and by he took part in the discussion, and "they were amazed at his understanding and answers." There is nothing in the account to justify us in thinking that Jesus assumed the role of teacher; he was simply there as a reverent and dutiful scholar, answering their questions and asking them questions in return.

It would be most natural for the scribes on these occasions to talk to the people about the institution of the Passover, and how God had brought their fathers out of Egypt with a mighty hand; and perhaps Jesus by his questions led them to speak of the deep inner meaning of the Passover, and the Lamb of God therein typified, who should be slain for the sins of the world. Let us turn our thoughts again to Joseph and Mary. After going a day's journey they made enquiry for Jesus among their kinsfolk and acquaintances. As they continued to seek for him and found him not they must have grown very anxious about him, and I think that his mother slept little that night. A child of twelve alone in Jerusalem! and in such a crowd! When the

long night had passed and morning finally dawned they started back to the city, seeking for Jesus. Their first day's journey had not been a long one. Fatigued by the observance of the feast, and the pressing crowd, it was usual to travel only about eight miles on the first day of the homeward journey. So Joseph and Mary soon reached Jerusalem again, and began their search. Perhaps they first looked for the lost boy where the children were accustomed to gather for play, or where some strange sight was to be seen—but in no such place as that were they to find him. At last, after three days of anxiety and fears, they found him where they should have sought him in the beginning—in the holy temple When they went in, there he was, "sitting in the midst of the doctors."

They were amazed at the sight. Here was their meek and retiring child, holding familiar converse with the most grave and learned doctors of the law. And they were listening to him with respect, and close attention. There were giants in Jerusalem in those days. The learned Hillel and Gamaliel were at the height of their influence and reputation ; and one or both of them may have been in the company with Jesus. Joseph seems to have been speechless with astonishment; but the mother-heart of Mary at once broke through all bounds, and rushing forward she cried out, "Son, why has thou thus dealt with us? Behold thy father and I sought thee sorrowing." These are words of love; but they are words of gentle reprimand also. Doubtless this was the first time Mary had ever felt it necessary to reprimand her son.

To her question Jesus replied, "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" It was as though he had said, "It was not necessary that ye seek me; if ye wanted me ye might have known where to find me—in my Father's house." Jesus heart was so full of holy emotion; the new idea of his peculiar relation to the Father so absorbed his mind that it may have seemed to him his mother should be aware of it too.

Note the words of Jesus here. They are the first recorded words of our Lord, and as such have peculiar interest for us.

Those blessed lips, which afterwards spoke such words of sweetness and comfort to a discouraged world, now open for the first time, and their message is about the Father. The last words of him while in the flesh, too, were about the Father, and this was Jesus' message to the world—*The Fatherhood of God.*

We read that when Jesus replied thus to his parents "they understood not the saying which he spake unto them." We are not surprised that Joseph did not know what these words meant; but it does seem that Mary should have known something of their meaning. Is it possible that she had forgotten the wonderful annoucement of the angel that he was to be great, and should be called the Son of the Highest? Had she forgotten the worship of the wise men? the song of old Simeon at the presentation in the temple? and the miraculous preservation of the young life from the wrath of Herod? Not entirely. But twelve long years had passed since these marvellous events had happened; doubtless there had been nothing else unusual about the little boy's life during all these years; and so Mary's eye had been dimmed by time, and her memory dulled by the commonplace things of life. She did not realize that her child was to be the Saviour of the world.

It would not have been well for Mary to have had a full realization of the dignity and exaltedness of her divine Son from his childhood. If she had known that the little babe who nursed her bosom, slept so sweetly in her arms, or kneeled in evening prayer at her knee, was very God, for whose coming the world waited, how could she have given him proper human training? God, who directed Christ's early life and ours, has done all things well.

But if Joseph and Mary did not know, Jesus now knew who he was. God was his Father, in an especial and peculiar sense. He had a mission to perform different from that of all other men on earth. And so he must be "about the things of his Father."

But, although this was his Father's house, and he was engaged in his Father's business, his time had not yet fully come.

Therefore he dutifully went down with them to Nazareth, and was subject unto them. To him it was indeed a *going down*, both literally and figuratively: down from the proud capital to the despised province; down from the gorgeous temple to the little synagogue; down from his Heavenly Father's house to the humble home of his mother. I think Jesus would fain have tarried in the temple at Jerusalem; but he was still a child, subject to his earthly parents, and present duty required that he return with them. So he went back to obscure Nazareth, and was obedient to them in all things. There he increased in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and man.

And here the curtain again falls and hides him from our view for eighteen long years, until at last his merciful mission began with his baptism in the Jordan. Since then no curtain and no power can hide him from the adoring view of loyal, loving hearts.

This tender incident has its lessons. Christ by his own conduct has set before all children an inspiring example of filial love. By his own subjection he would teach little boys and girls to be dutiful and obedient, and to remain in subjection to their parents in all things.

We learn here that children are members of God's Church by birthright; and that it is their privilege and duty to claim a share in the holy covenant as soon as they reach years of responsibility. Christ grew up with the idea in his mind that he was already within the kingdom, and with the expectation of publicly claiming his birthright as soon as he reached the required age.

Another profitable lesson for us here is Christ's perfect humanity. We see him in the near relation to his earthly parents; we see him gradually developing physically and spiritually as other men; we see something of the thoughts and emotions that welled up in his sacred heart. He was made in all points like as we are, yet without sin. And by this he is made so much nearer and dearer to us.

Thanks be to God for this beautiful incident in the child-life of our blessed Lord.

ARTICLE VII.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

By Prof. David H. Bauslin, D. D.

If we were called to summarize the theological thought of the times, it would be that, according to the letter and spirit of recent theology, the defence of Christianity now has two duties: The first of these duties is to show that anti-Christian views of the world, such as the monistic or pantheistic, are scientifically untenable; while the second is, that modern science shows no results which are contradictory of the Christian faith, or in any true sense a nullification of its doctrines. The great mark of our times, scientific and practical, is the undue stress laid upon this present world and life. "Development" does not explain the problem of being, but only pushes it back, in all probability, some millions of years. The modern spirit tries also to separate ethics from religion. That spirit seeks for an "ethical culture" that is to be dissociated from belief in God. Such ethics however, as has been demonstrated time and again, is like unto a rose separated from its stem, with the possibility of life only so long as a little sap is left in it. Another thing is being made more and more manifest in the theological thinking of the times, that to teach Christianity without miracles is labor in vain and that for a religion dissociated from the supernatural, there is no possible hope of success. Our religion rests upon three kinds of miracles—natural, spiritual and historical, of which the spiritual is the most important. The proof from experience cannot give absolute certainty of the truth of Christianity; neither can the proof be found alone in Bible authority expressed in mechanical views of inspiration, but both experience and biblical au-

thority must be supported by the historic Christ. He must not be the vague and uncertain Christ of the Ritschlians, but the supernatural, the divine and human, the miraculous, crucified and risen Christ, who is revealed in fulness in the New Testament. Blass the eminent philologist, takes the liberal theologians to task, in a recent lecture on "The Scriptures and the Protestant Church." He makes a distinction between a scientific theology which subjects itself to the Bible and one which subjects the Bible to itself. The latter sort of scientific theology, on one ground and another, does not hesitate to dispute the resurrection of Christ, and in so doing declares all the apostles liars and deceivers. Such action, he says, shows an utter lack of scientific criticism. Blass is a layman, and he holds that, for a so-called Christian theologian, to face the apostles and reject heir united and uniform testimony is to show unfitness for the work of a Christian teacher.

This it seems to us is the real signification of the theological situation now confronting us. The question of the hour is this: Is a new era in the history—we will not say of Christianity—but of religion about to be inaugurated?

Christianity being a system built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, any entering wedge that will effectually separate the foundation from the corner-stone, the prophets and the apostles from Christ, must also sooner or later bring down in inextricable ruins the whole superstructure, much of the material that has entered into it may at last be gathered out of the debris and wrought into another structure of some sort, but we must not lose sight of the fact that it will be in a distinct sense another structure. Those who are engaged in diligently driving the wedge need not blink their grave responsibility.

The issue must be faced in our day and generation. The question for some teachers of religion is this, are they prepared to assume the roll of the founders of a new and more or less elective and syncretistic species of Christianity? If so, who or what shall be the chief corner-stone and who or what shall constitute the precious foundation?

The issue for others of us is this: Are we prepared to accept this proposed substitute for the foundation, which, from of old, has consisted of the prophets and apostles, and which has Jesus Christ himself as the chief corner-stone? The issue is becoming plainer every day, and the lines of conflict are being drawn with an increasing tension.

New England theology designates a species of Christian thought which was developed in this country between 1730 and 1830. It attracted attention, was brought under discussion, and acquired a fuller and fuller statement from time to time throughout the one hundred years between the periods above noted.

This theological movement was begun without even a surmise of the path to be traversed, or of the result to be reached. The initial purpose seems to have been simply resistance to certain influences which, it was feared, were leading many people astray from the truths of the gospel. One treatise on theology led to another, critiques led to defenses of doctrines for the truth's sake, until finally a large body of theological literature came into existence. Various names were from time to time applied to this system of divinity, it being called in some quarters, with a sort of mild derision, "New Light," "New Divinity" and "Berkshire Divinity." As a scheme of Christian thought New England Theology assumed various phases, one being permanent at one time and another at another time, but there are four which assumed from the names of their chief expounders, special designations, viz., Edwardsianism, Hopkinsianism, Emmonsism and Taylorism. The second and fourth of these were the most marked. Ranked according to their Calvinistic tendencies the older theologians of this school were known as "Old Calvinists," "Moderate Calvinists" and "Consistent Calvinists," or according to the somewhat acrostic classification of the late Professor Edwards A. Park, "Calvinist," "Calvinistic," "Calvinistical" and "Calvinisticalish."

It will thus be seen at a glance that New England Theology has passed through a great variety of phases and has been subject to great fluctuations from time to time. Its latest phase has

been called the "New Theology." The difference between all phases of this latest evolution of New England religious thought and every phase of the older development is marked, and in some of its forms, radical. That a long distance has been covered between the older types and the new is decidedly manifest in a recently published book, by a New England theological teacher, Professor Levi Leonard Paine of the Bangor Congregational Theological Seminary.

The title of Prof. Paine's book, this last and radical interpretation of New England theology is "A Critical History of the Evolution of Trinitarianism, and its Outcome in the New Christology." A competent critic has said somewhat extravagantly, we think, that this is "the most remarkable book issued from the press in the United States during the present year." We think it would be more safely within the limits of moderation to say that of the strictly theological books of the current year thus far, none will compare with it in the matter of its incongruity with the source from which it proceeds, or the startling nature of the conclusions reached by its author.

The title of the book and the position of its author as a teacher of candidates for the ministry in what claims to be an evangelical school, would lead one to expect a calm and judicial contribution to the interesting domain of the history of doctrine. But a man does not need to travel far in Prof. Paines book until he finds he is dealing not with a judicial contribution to historical theology but with a vehement polemic. In the first half of his treatise the author proposes to trace the growth of the Trin itarian idea from its origins. His first conclusion is the astounding one that the Trinitarian idea has neither beginning roots, nor germs of any kind in the Scriptures. The Old Testament knows nothing but monotheism, and any suspicion or inkling of more than one person in the Godhead would have been a fatal first step towards polytheism, against which the entire drift of Hebrew thinking militates. After thus rapidly sketching this position he goes on to allege further that as far as the New Testament is concerned, the same conclusion may be maintained. He recognizes two kinds of sources behind the New Testament:

first the simple, early and credible sources, like the gospel of Mark and large portions of Matthew and Luke and the whole of John. These arose at a later date and embodied traditions and legends that confused and blurred the real facts of the life and work of Jesus. Of these two claims of sources we are, of course, to take the first one as our basis; and when we do this all idea of a trinity in the Godhead disappears. Neither Jesus nor any of his immediate followers knew anything of this idea. They uniformly represent him as a mere man. The only distinction they claim for him is a superior knowledge and clear consciousness, so to speak, of his direct relation of sonship with God. This consciousness they represent him as trying to impart to others. That is all of his work and all of his teaching. The doctrine of the Trinity thus deprived of all scriptural foundation is then shown to rest upon post-apostolic speculations and misconceptions.

During the ante-Nicene period, according to Prof. Paine's consciousness, certainly not according to the facts, that doctrine reaches a certain stage of development marked by the speculations of Origen and Athanasius. In these writers the doctrine consists of the recognition of a tri-personality in God with the subordination of the Son and Holy Spirit to the Father. Essentially this is tri-theistic. With Augustine a new cycle begins. The Neoplatonic philosophy, which was essentially panthetisic in its principles, is taken as the ground of speculation. All thinking on the subject of the Trinity is thenceforth dominated by this incipient pantheism and reverts back to Sabellius. The history of Trinitarianism since Augustine is nothing but a play of differing shades of Sabellianism. Prof. Paine illustrates this especially by examining New England Trinitarianism. He passes in review the most prominent thinkers of this country, from Edwards to Phillips Brooks and Geo. S. Goodson, and charges each of them in turn with holding a form of Sabellianism. In fact the daring author alleges that no further changes are possible nor must any be accepted. The cycle has been run, and the revolving force in this Trinitarian conception has been exhausted.

We have thus endeavored fairly and truthfully to set forth the teaching of this book. It is at the point at which we have arrived that Prof. Paine assumes the roll of a prophet. What next? is the question he endeavors to answer, and his answer is in entire harmony with the principles of his critical history, as we have thus far sketched it.

"It would not be surprising" says our author, "if it should be found that there are some Trinitarians who are 'unconscious' Unitarians." We should certainly think so, but with the added reflection that there can be no unconsciousness about Prof. Paine's location. His judgment is that the old theology has run its course and that it can neither be restored to its former power nor modified by any sort of amendment or compromise and made to serve any good purpose. The only place for it is the place where other ancient things are stored, in the museum of antiquities. What is needed indeed, in fact what must come, is a new theology without any sort of contact with the old, save perhaps the name of Jesus Christ.

But the question arises, what shall this New Theology be? It is at this point that, like all destructive critics of his sort, Prof. Paine leaves us like Mohammed's coffin hanging in perplexing uncertainty and peril, between the heavens and the earth. It is not possible, says he, to outline the New Theology at this present time. The time for reconstruction has not come and cannot in the nature of the case, come until all debris resulting from the crumbling down and destruction of the old has been removed. Nevertheless in Prof. Paine's book we can see some advanced plans of the new structures: 1. The New Theology is to be constructed upon the inductive method, pure and simple. 2. It is to be moulded by the historical, the religious and the rational tendencies of our age. 3. It is to eschew the speculative and metaphysical method altogether. 4. As to its content it is to begin with the idea of God, not as the infinite and absolute spirit, for that would involve metaphysics. God is to be conceived of as a person of vast magnitude, but otherwise just like man. 5. Man is to be conceived of as the last result of the process of evolution Christ as simply a man; the Bible

a collection of fragments, remnants of a remarkable but not unique literature; the supernatural as impossible and unhistorical; the atonement as a coming of man into the consciousness of his true relation with God.

Such are some of the elements of the new system of New England theology, as we gather them from Prof. Paine's interesting book, the most striking characteristic of which, we hardly need say, is its uncompromising radicalism. Mere radicalism of course, is no sign of truth or falsehood, soundness or unsoundness, but the singular thing about the radicalism of this book is that it is put forth in the interest of historic continuity. Another conspicuous feature of this author's thinking is his attitude toward thinkers of all schools. He moves in the usual atmosphere of assumed superiority and cock-sureness so characteristic of advanced and liberal religious thinkers. He names no other writers as far as we have been able to discern except to criticize and condemn.

The fault which vitiates the whole method of Prof. Paine's thinking is his entire inability to realize the value of the philosophic element in correct scientific method. He seems to be entirely unaware of the fact that when he is declaiming against metaphysics in theology with real iconoclastic fury that he himself is planted upon a metaphysical basis of a very poor sort. He desires to ignore all the innate ideas which lie at the foundation of thinking, but finds much difficulty in so doing. He is inexorable on this subject but very inconsistently so, and has accordingly, as we deem it, made a grotesque as well as a superficial effort at becoming a sort of John the Baptist for a new theology in a country in which there are many rejected and abandoned theological speculations to admonish him against such unwisdom. If appeal be made to the historic sense of which our author makes so much use, his prophecy to which we have already made reference looks as if it were foreordained to disappointment.

II.

GERMAN.

By Rev. S. Gring Hefelbower, A. M.

In the May number of the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Buettner, of Belgard, Pomerania, discusses "Zinzendorf's Service in Theology." We have long ago forsaken Bengel's adverse judgment as to the work of Herrnhut. Zinzendorf was a pathfinder in mission work, and the organizations scattered throughout the world, which his spirit pervaded, were places where the holy fire was fostered. "There is not a hymn-book in German evangelical Christianity that does not contain hymns by Zinzendorf. They belong to the noblest part of our hymnology, as well as do the hymns of Luther and Gerhardt." He also helped the Lutheran Church toward a proper appreciation of the work of laymen, which the Reformed Church had from the beginning. Although he busied himself with theology, and was recognized by the Teubingen faculty as a "Lutheran theologian," no one regards him in that light now. With the exception of several catechisms he wrote nothing of a scientific character. However, he offers material to the church historian. And in the field of exegesis he made several attempts but accomplished nothing. He was not a learned theorist, but a practical man, a man of life and experience. Yet, nevertheless, his influence can be traced in several very important doctrines.

He made Christ the star and center of all theology. His preaching of the eternal divinity of Christ was as a dam in the stream of the rationalism that denied Christ. It is true that he emphasized the divinity of Christ at the expense of the revelation of God the Father, but he did it in such a way that it did not prevent him from coming to a proper appreciation of Christ's full humanity, which the Lutheran Church up until his time had not taught, and from the standpoint of the *communicatio*

idiomatum, could not teach. And though the Reformed theologians were clear as to Christ's humanity, they placed the two natures together in such a way that the unity of the personality was lost. "No one will expect that Zinzendorf gave a complete and clear solution to those very difficult problems in Christology, He was not the man for that. But he gave fruitful thoughts and hints, which the more recent representatives of the doctrine of Kenosis, each one in his own way laying hold of the ingenious suggestions of Zinzendorf, could deepen and establish scientifically: a problem in Dogmatics, which, in spite of the works of Hofmann, Thomasius, Getz and Frank, is far from a satisfactory solution even at the present time." In spite of certain errors, he has been called "the father of the modern Kenotic Christology."

His teaching in regard to Holy Scripture departs from traditional orthodoxy in a somewhat analogous way. In both he conceived of the human element in a real and more living way. In no other doctrine were the errors of scholasticism so apparant as in the teaching of Lutheran and Reformed dogmaticians on this subject. No one dared to judge as liberally in regard to the individual books as did Luther. "Scripture and revelation had been identified for some time." The Holy Ghost was regarded as the author of the bible. "The prophets and the apostles were merely the writers for whom the Holy Spirit dictated revelation to their pens." Quenstedt taught that difference of style was due to accommodation to the personality of the writer on the part of the Holy Spirit. Calovius accounted for it by the nature of the material. Zinzendorf protested aaingt this, reverently but firmly. He taught that the content of the bible was the thoughts of the heart of God, but that in other things it was the same as everything else that was touched by the hand of man. In this he was far in advance of any man of his day. He also appreciated the different degrees of knowledge and life as seen in the Old and New Testaments. And in his estimation of the New Testament he opened the way for those who find differences in the doctrinal conceptions as presented by the different writers.

Zinzendorf's teaching concerning repentance corrected certain errors of his time. "In spite of all Spener's warning, Pietism had departed from the healthful teaching of the Scripture in this doctrine. According to the pietistic conceptions we should not consider anybody converted who had not fought through the *agon poenitentiae* with its various stages. According to this teaching there belonged to true repentence "a mighty inward struggle, lasting a long time, a hard fight with sin and the flesh, and an increasing sadness that almost reached dispair. Then by a sudden act of grace on the part of the Spirit the individual was lead out of this into the blessed joy of the children of God. Every converted man must be able to tell the day and the hour when grace triumphed with him." With this idea of repentance in mind Zinzendorf struggled twelve years with no rssults, save that he saw its error. According to Pietism and Lutheran orthodoxy an essential element of repentance was fear of God's wrath and eternal punishment. Zinzendorf went much deeper. He taught that sin was to be regarded in two ways. On the one hand it is a debt, a burden, a torment. On the other it is an act that is not pleasing to God. Most persons regarded it in the former light and have a selfish fear of damnation and do not become converted because they hate the sinful act itself. Zinzendorf claimed that real repentance was brought about not by the law, but by the gospel, more exactly, by the sum total of the gospel, by Christ's sufferings. Pietism called the sinner to the struggle of repentance. Zinzendorf pointed him directly to the Saviour and his grace. However, in emphasizing the gospel he underestimated the law.

The old orthodoxy found certainty of salvation in objective divine acts. Pietism laid all emphasis on feeling. Zinzendorf took a middle position and united the elements of truth in both tendencies.

In the April number of the "*Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*," Ihmels, of Erlangen, publishes a lecture which essays to answer the question: "How Do We Become Certain of Christian Truth." It is of particular interest because it comes from the newest professional advocate of the so-called Erlangen theology.

This question concerning the reality of the truths of Christianity is the chief hindrance that confronts Christian students of to-day. The time is forever past when certainty was handed down as an inheritance from generation to generation. The Reformation sprung from the question concerning the personal certainty of salvation. The two questions are closely related, and it is plain that the only way that leads to a certainty of Christian truth is the same way by which God leads us to a certainty of salvation. Luther saw clearly that new answers must be given to both questions. In reality the anwser to this burning question of to-day is only a further development of what Luther suggested.

It follows from the very nature of Christianity. For Christian truth is not a conglomerate of doctrines. It is rather the facts of God's revelation. "In a word, the Christian certainty of truth is certainty in regard to the reality of fellowship with God as it is revealed through Christ." It necessarily follows that personal experience alone can open the way to this certainty. Without this experience I may know of the fellowship, but I cannot know it. Schleiermacher laid the foundation for this when in 1799 he declared that religion was an "immediate experience of the Divine." It is true that he went to extremes and gave up too much of the positive content of Christianity. "This entire attempt to answer the above question is undertaken on the basis of the definite presupposition that there is objective Christian truth with which Christianity stands or falls." We can learn from Schleiermacher that subjective certainty of that truth can be attained only by religious experience. "The facts of revelation are available to us only in the testimony of the bearers of revelation as it is fixed in Scripture and lives on in the Church." Thus it is plain that historical criticism has much to do with our certainty. But it cannot give us the ultimate ground. "The word of God, whether fixed in Scripture or living in the Church, testifies of itself. It is God himself that in this word forces himself upon man and testifies of himself in such a way that man ventures to believe the word that came to him to be the word of God." This occurs through the

agency of the Holy Ghost, who brings to the individual the revelation once given to humanity. "As the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom God's revelation came to its close, is still ever present in the Holy Spirit in the Church, so, in turn, it is the only office of this Holy Spirit to glorify Christ out of this word and to bring him so near to hearts that they become certain of this word and thereby certain of the revelation of God." God himself overcomes our doubt, works faith in us and makes us certain in regard to the truth which he himself is.

"This knowledge is emancipating, but on the other hand, it is, of course, no less serious. For it follows that religious certainty of truth can be present only with those who wish to experience the secret of religion itself. Thereby the way to certainty of truth becomes necessarily serious as religion itself is serious." It is the crucified Saviour through whom God comes into fellowship with us. But all this depends upon our knowledge of sin. Through this alone we can come to certainty in regard to the crucified and resurrected Son of God. "The way to Christian cerrainty can be described only by starting from the peculiar object with which it has to deal." But after that has been done, there is a certain resemblance between it and the way to knowledge in general.

In so far as this certainty of truth is conditioned by personal experience it is conditioned by the will. All depends upon whether the individual is receptive to the witness that God gives of himself. Yet we dare not regard the theoretical assurances of truth as superfluous. Just as the working of the Holy Ghost demands a certain psychological mediation, so the natural confirmation of truth has a meaning for the genesis of faith. In the presence of doubt a Christian may for a moment be compelled to retreat to his experience of certainty. "But it is an emergency and cannot last. The need of unity in our knowledge necessarily demands a solution of such a contradiction." The chief thing is that man holds himself open to receive the witness that God gives of himself in days of trial and in the voice of conscience, and above all, in the historically given revelation. He must hear and read God's word. But the objec-

tion is raised that scientific considerations prevent an unbiased use of the word. Such considerations and doubts should not be put down by force. We should strive to solve them. But we can demand of a man that he do not allow them to restrain him from letting God's word testify of itself. If some things are not clear it is certain that enough are clear of which the Holy Ghost can testify. In fact, all depends upon whether the individual really begins to let God's word work upon him and then also earnestly to translate into life all the knowledge that God gives him. It is plain that in the final issue all depends upon the will. Jno. 7 : 17.

The first thing that God will call forth in man by his revelation is prayer, which cannot be overemphasized. Only by prayer can we grow into fellowship with our Father.

It may be objected that the certainty thus attained is wholely subjective. But all certainty is necessarily ultimately subjective. Christian certainty, though not shared by all, when present is necessarily more certain than other knowledge, because it is so inseparably interwoven with the personality of man. A man can think as he chooses concerning things in the external world, and his personality remains untouched. But it is different with moral and religious truth. Christian certainty is, in the stricter sense, self-certainty. The Christian first really finds himself when he finds God

The above does not offer a proof for those who are outside of Christianity. In fact a conclusive proof cannot be given for those who want to remain at a distance from God and his word. "Christian certainty of truth is simply certainty of faith and must so remain." But he who has it knows that it is not imagination when the apostle in the evening of his life said, "I know whom I have believed."

In June and July numbers of the *Theologische Rundschau*, Prof. Baldensperger, of Giessen, writes of "Recent Investigations Concerning the Son of Man." Students have been trying to get back to the historical content of the name, but the results,

thus far attained, differ so widely that an agreement seems to be farther away than ever.

Formerly the work was limited to an exegetical investigation of the Greek title, with little reference to the passage in Daniel. The common conclusion was, that by its use Jesus would express his relation to man. About twenty years ago investigators began to seek the meaning of the title from the passage in Daniel and contemporary Jewish literature. Then they sought it in pre-Christian literature and at length men began to note its messianic eschatological character. This was followed by the Aramaic stage of the discussion, which attempted an interpretation by translating the term out of the Greek into the language of Christ and his apostles. In Arabic there is no distinction between "the Son of Man" and "the man." Therefore as used by Christ it had no messianic meaning. Different writers of this class give it different meanings at different places, such as, man in general; Mark 2 : 28. At another place, Math. 11 : 19, it is equivalent to "some one." And still others make it synonomous with the first personal pronoun. Luke 6 : 22, Math. 16 : 13. The debate that has been going on has made it plain that the decision depends largely upon the general conception of the person of Christ that is entertained by the individual. It all depends upon whether a man recognizes the Messiahship of Jesus as an historical element, the center of his inner life, or as a mere accident. It is gratifying to know that Harnack in his most recent book takes a very decided stand in defense of full messianic meaning of the title.

Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, who died in Germany the latter part of August was one of the most erratic thinkers the world has ever produced. He was born near Leipzig in 1844, was educated at Bonn and at the early age of 25 became professor of classical philology at the University of Basle. The closing years of his life were spent in an asylum, after, as has been caustically suggested, perhaps with only too much truth, his insane philosophy had driven him insane.

His writings are not numerous and are characterized by a

very superior diction and a revolutionary mode of thought that denies all that is taught and believed. In the decade between 1885 and 1895 many ardent admirers and zealous defenders of him and of his works appeared, and a voluminous literature sprung up about his name; but of late a reaction seems to have set in, and almost all publications that appear at the present time are severely critical. His classical German attracted many young students who later saw his folly in spite of its nice linguistic dress. He was a mad, raving egotist, who would give the world a cut-throat philosophy of nonsense and a non- and anti-moral system of ethics. To him Kant was a clever fool. Schopenhauer was a wise man, whom he himself resembled. His ethics and religion, if there was any, were founded on a sort of cult of genius. His system has been called a "Lord and Slave Morality." Development by the survival of the fittest is the law of the universe; therefore we should not save the weak. Let pestilence and famine and war rage. It is right, for the fittest will survive. The genius is over all and all who are below him are his slaves to the end that he may become more highly developed. He looked upon the Christian religion as the worst religion the world had and our Christian civilization as mere barbarism. Ritschl and Grimm, in their recent pamphlets touching his work, see practically no service in his life, save that of a negative character.

Prof. Ziegler, of Strassburg, chose as the theme of his inaugural address as Rector of the University, "Faith and Knowledge." The relation is very complicated and is sometimes contradictory and hostile. But we cannot set it aside, as did Tertullian, by saying: "What has Athens to do with Jerusalem?" because there is a certain amount of knowledge in faith, and the student must make faith an object of his thought. Pfennigsdorf sums up Ziegler's solution somewhat as follows:

According to him Schleirmacher gave the solution of the conflict between knowledge and faith. All attempts to raise faith up to knowledge, somewhat "in the form of conceptions," as Hegel has attempted, are untenable and only injure the author-

ity of falth. It is not a thing of the understanding, but of the inner life. The judgments of faith are judgments of feeling, dictated by feeling and exercising a devotional influence upon inner life. The objects of faith are supersensible and therefore cannot be proven (Kant). Faith and knowledge are wholely different as to foundation and method. In order to express itself in regard to the world and life and to formulate its doctrines faith needs the existing knowledge and means of knowledge that are found in contemporary philosophy and history. Note, for example, the amalgamation of the Christian faith with elements of the Greek philosophy. Faith, which, according to its essence, is conservative, holds tenaciously to that which it once accepted. Science, on the other hand, engaged in ceaseless change and transformation, no longer recognizes those elements. Here the strife begins, ln which faith grows so easily intolerant and science so easily arrogant. "The flames of the fagot-heaps on which Giordano Bruno in Rome, or Michael Servet in Geneva, gave up their lives as martyrs for science, are just as hard to forget as the wounding, harsh words of a science that has become materialistic, concerning an implicit faith that is conservative."

Scientific theology is to undertake mediation in this conflict. It will not deny the contradiction nor soften it down to the advantage of either side, but it will prove it to be unavoidable. Thus it will remove from the struggle the sting of malevolence and help us to a reconciliation of that contradiction, which, at the present time, as a disturbing factor, is interwoven in the life of the individual as well as in that of the entire people.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

MACMILLAN AND COMPANY, 66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

Ethics and Revelation. By Prof. H. S. Nash, Price $1.50.

This book by Prof. Nash seems to comprise a series of six lectures, prepared by him under the auspices of *The John Bohlen Lectureship*, of continuous drift in purport and discussion with the subject of the first lecture of the series, *Ethics and Revelation.* The reader soon discovers that they are all in the line of what Prof. Nash had to say, in his book entitled, *Genesis of the Social Conscience*, which arrested the attention of the thinking community as one of "the world's stock of good books," and secured for the author an acknowledged place of preeminence among those dealing with the "social problem," as we call it—a bundle of interests which takes in everything of importance in the social life of our modern time.

We had scarce ceased reading that book, when this other comes to us, with the proffer of additional help, in the way of elucidating, more at large, certain great matters which could only look at us from distant points of suggestion in that first book. As if it should say: Now that we know how the social conscience developed through the pagan and Christian civilizations, arriving at last at a conception of the "universal individual," and the democracy in which that idea must incorporate itself, and through which it must work to the enfranchisement of the lowest man, it behooves us to look, more in detail, at what the Bible and the Church had to do with this, especially as the whole sociological problem has fallen into scientific hands, and science and revelation have been acting shy of one another through all these years. Having in a most masterly way illustrated the spiritual significance of history in the discovered moral value of "individuality,"—considered, of course in the light of its universal human and divine implications, justifying the author in saying: "There is nothing good but individuality"—this work done, very naturally the next thing to be looked after, as having all along intruded its claim, was "to show that the Bible marks out the road along which conscience must travel, if it would treat our life on earth with abiding seriousness."

The burden of the new task, it will be seen at once, must be to adjust our Christian apologetics to the attitude of the representative outside modern man—the scientist, into whose hands the social problem has fallen. In the outburst of modern physical discovery, the material universe, for a time, quite covered the entire disk of the scientist's

vision, and he was disposed to be merry over the final disappearance of that "other world" so long dominating the mind of christendom in monastic dreams. His only gospel was the economics of the industrial era, and the only miracles he was in a mood to recognize, were the wonders that were daily breaking out all round the horizon of physical research. Metaphysics, philosophy, religion, he would have none of these. By and by he began to see that the larger reality with which he could have to do—conditioning the splendid discoveries he was making in the material world—was the free state, the safe society in which his thinking must be done. At that point the individuality of man, and the significance of history came to view, and after coquetting, for a time, with the unknowable, and its shadow of a shadow, agnosticism, as a religion, he frankly throws off these disguises, and takes the universe at the full measure of seriousness its mystery would require. Our modern representative man, as the Christian apologete finds him, is in search of a religion, as the necessary complement of the problem he has to solve. In history, in society, in the free state, he has discovered the stupendous fact of individuality, the ethical will, conscience, the ideas of right and justice, the fundamental reality on which society rests. And since all this, not to go outside of the visible universe, is but the "universal individual," or ethical will, coming into realization in history, and since the "total of science is an organism," the scientist comes to religion in the discovery, that every human being as a person possesses the infinite value of kinship with an eternal and common good.

Then comes the chapter on Comparative Religions—a masterly treatment—with reference to the principle of individuality, in which an inquiry is set up as to the competing claims of the great ethnic religions toward satisfying the scientific craving in this direction, effectually shutting off pantheism and Buddhism, because of their inadequate conception of individuality. "The scientist must view the principle of individuality as striking its root deep down into the fundamental being. The conception of ultimate being as personal, in its main intent, goes to this and no other conclusion. Whatever vulgar uses it has been put to in the past, whatever difficulties beset it in the present, this is the pith and marrow of it. The personality of God means that the substantial, the eternal good of the universe, are at the service of the principle of individuality; and that the universe does not keep in store for us a tragic disillusionment." The apologete proceeds to commend Christianity to science, as the religion fully measuring up to the new sense of the "seriousness of the universe," which is the distinctive acquisition of our modern time. We would like to believe that materialism has so far faded from the creed of our leading scientists, as to make the overture easy. The scientists are in quest of a religion, no doubt. They themselves, through the science of language and comparative religions, have demonstrated that religion is an essential element of

human nature, or, as the author would say, of individuality, which is the exhaustive good of the universe. But that they are in the mood of mental readiness to make Christianity the religious complement of their scientific habit of mind, is as yet an open question, although it must be conceded that the manifest trend of science is hopefully that way.

The whole discussion comes to a head in the last two chapters, "*Prophecy and History*," and "*The Christ and The Creative Good.*" No such splendid contribution to Christian apologetics has hitherto been made. The distinctive teaching of Christianity, the incarnation, as an historical fact, rationally accepted as the one event round which the whole creation moves—on this the whole discussion must turn. The divine personality must be shown to be communicable, if men are to share in the eternal good. Creation whispers this: the incarnation sounds it alone. "The belief in creation, and the attendant belief in an authoritative social conscience, set us in an expectant attitude regarding the fact of the incarnation. The New Testement commends Christ as the answer to the problem of conscience." It is impossible to convey to the reader any adequate idea of the originality and power of Prof. Nash's way of interlacing the vast themes of our Bible revelation with the movements of the social conscience—in this second-hand way. The book itself must be thoughtfully read and re-read, under the light of that imaginative glow of historic insight in which it was written.

Prof. Nash writes on these subjects in a highly luminous and strikingly suggestive and stimulating style. There are no tricks of rhetoric, no traces of a compulsory avoidance of the commonplace; everywhere he is clearly himself a "merchant of light." He is not discussive, and so far may be difficult reading to men of that habit of mind. He hovers over an idea as a bee hovers over a honey-cell, extracting its essence by successive soundings, and halting long enough to enjoy each draught in its enveloping sphere of fragrant air. We must take note of this, because a little while ago a complaint came from one of the leading literary critics of this country, that there was an alarming dirth of good, or even tolerable, writing, among all branches of the literary craft. The reason assigned was, that the most active thinkers of the age are occupied on sociological themes, and that they had set the type too much after the dry and frigid formulas of science, giving little place to the imagination, and letting the warm currents of individual feeling have little or no play. The result is, great floods of valuable and learned discussion on these absorbing topics are thrown upon the world, which are unreadable, except by specialists, to whom the dust and litter of the scientific work-shop are just as interesting as the most intricate and wonderful invention awaiting their scrutiny on the stocks. It is the dead or living facts they want; stark, statistical, dry, and they suspect all amenities of expression, and coloring of style, as so much verbal surplussage, and vicious interference with the truth of things.

Prof. Nash has demonstrated that the suspicion is groundless, by admitting the high glow of imaginative feeling in his representation of historical drifts and tendencies, that are none the less exhaustive and masterful for the tasteful habiliment in which they are clothed.

W. H. WYNN.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. A Practical Exposition. By Chas. Gore, A. M., D. D., of the Community of the Resurrection, Canon of Westminster, Hon. Chaplain to the Queen. Vol. II. (Chapters IX–XVI).

The favorable attention of the readers of *The Quarterly* was recently called to the first volume of this work. The excellent qualities which marked the first volume are fully maintained in this. The method of exposition—proceeding by sections, according to the Revised Version, prefacing each by an analysis or paraphrase—aptly provides for developing and fixing the doctrinal teaching and bringing to view the rich practical lessons for the Christian life. As the first volume was specially marked by its distinct exposition of the doctrine of justification by faith and the strong emphasis placed upon it as unfolding the way of salvation, the present volume is marked by its clear elucidation of the Apostle's teaching concerning the nature and scope of "election" in chapters IX and X of the Epistle. Had not St. Paul's teaching been so long and seriously misinterpreted, and the false interpretation so widely counted identical with the doctrine of Christianity itself, the present wide-spread confessional disturbance could have no place. Canon Gore has done good service in this distinct re-showing of the true sense of the apostolic teaching.

Passing on to the twelfth and following chapters, in which St. Paul proceeds to make practical application of the truths of salvation to the needs and duties of the Christian life, our author is, for the most part, equally happy in his explanations and suggestions. As was the case in the first volume, his training and position in the Anglican Church reveal themselves here and there in some distinctive types of church-view from which many readers will probably dissent, but the exposition is so enriched with passages of suggestive and pertinent Christian truth that the points of difference will be easily excused. An appendix of 39 pages of "Notes" on points touched in the body of the work, completes the valuable volume.

M. VALENTINE.

The Messages of the Apostles. By George Barker Stevens, Ph. D., D. D., Prof. of Systematic Theology, Yale. Cloth bound. 258 pp. Price $1.00.

Number XII of the series "The Messages of the Bible," edited by Profs. Sanders and Kent.

This volume includes the apostolic discourses contained in the earlier chapters of Acts, and the canonical epistles (except the first nine and Philemon, which appeared in a former volume), arranged in an approximately chronological order. A very commendable introduction presents the historical facts cencerning the early Church and its conflicts, with which one must be familiar to appreciate the writings which follow. Prefatory to the apostolic discourses, are set forth the problems which the Church had to solve; and the consequent apologetic, didactic, admonitory, and predictive elements of the first sermons. Each epistle is preceded by remarks on the authorship, date, purpose, and contents. Obscure passages and apparent contradictions, such as the teachings of Paul and James on justification, are satisfactorily explained. The messages themselves are rendered in free paraphrase. A substitute for the authorized text is not attempted; but the author endeavors to present the thought of the apostles so that it may create the impression originally intended. An appendix furnishes references for further reading. The work serves as a simple and popular commentary.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York].

Paul of Tarsus. Robert Bird. p. 515. Price $2.00.

After recalling the many lives which have been written of St. Paul, one could scarcely think there was room for another. It must be admitted, however, that Mr. Bird, in this volume, has made for his book a rightful and commanding place by reason of his graphic pictures and of the group of readers he has had in view. This is not a child's life of St Paul and it is just as far removed from a scholar's demands. It was prepared, like Mr. Bird's *Jesus the Carpenter of Nazareth*, to command the attention of the youth of England and to make real the *life*, rather than the writings of the great Apostle to the Gentiles.

Three factors go to make the author an eminently successful writer for youth. His style is as simple and clear as any English we have ever read. An occasional bit of over-color is pardonable in the light of the demand of the average boy and girl of sixteen. But nowhere does the word-picture degenerate into a mist of mere color.

He is master of classical history. His easy command of all that pertains to Greek and Roman life and thought is utilized to give setting and contrast to the distinctively Hebrew thought and character of his central figure.

He is master of the topography of Greece, Italy, Asia Minor and Palestine. I confess to feeling the actual nature-atmosphere of the east more pronouncedly in reading this book than in studying any of the more profound writers upon biblical travel and exploration.

He is above all a sympathetic interpreter of Hebrew thought and Christian theology. His book does not pretend to outline the dogma of

the Apostle, but by a continuous use of his letters and apistles, by a graphic delineation of his transition from a narrow, intense Phariseeism to a broad and rich Christian experience, Mr. Bird reveals a wonderful insight into Paul's character and thought processes.

The chapters are made quite short as a constant inducement for youthful readers The book if placed in the hands of any reading boy or girl will hold the attention with any biography of the age. Mr. Bird has certainly given us a most vivid and charming presentation of the most remarkable Jew in history. E. H. DELK.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

Postmarked "Colima." By Julia Suesserott Alleman. Cloth. 12 mo. pp. 253. $1.25.

This book, the third of the John Rung Prize Series, has the initial advantage of a catchy title, suggesting just enough of the story to serve as a relish. It is also the keynote of the entire book, whose plot is nothing more than the history of a lost letter, and of those whose lives were affected by it.

Thc book is a love-story, pure and simple. It makes no claim to be anything else. The lost letter is the heroine's answer to a proposal—an affirmative answer, which would have made two lives very different if it had been received, A peculiar combination of circumstances lays the letter aside for twenty-five years, and then brings it again to light, to reunite the sundered lovers at last.

The chief merit of the story, in the eyes of those who contemplate placing it in the hands of the young people, is the use which the heroine makes of her years of waiting. She spends them in a little sea side village, doing good in a beautiful and quiet way, to the simple folks who have need of her help. No dream of a larger sphere, nor even the sincere and manly love of the young minister—whom we must be pardoned for preferring to the actual hero— can draw her away from her work of love; she grows into great sweetness of character, and is affectionately called, by the objects of her care, "St. Frances." It is a pleasant touch of human nature when, at the end of the book, the sailor lover returns at last, and she sails away with him, the woman overcoming the saint.

In general, while the book—as has been said—is from first to last a love story, it is such a one as any boy or girl may read with safety. The story of a pure and faithful love, and of a life ennobled by it, is worth the perusal of any one, young or old.

The story is pleasantly related; the style is smooth and equal, making a very readible narrative. As the tale of a long and mysterious time of hope deferred, and a reunion at middle age, after many sorrows, we should hardly expect highly-wrought scenes, or great stress of passion, but a soft minor tone, such as the writer maintains throughout.

We might wish that the scenes of foreign travel had been given more

space, or less. Many interesting details of Japanese life are given, some of them as minute as would be expected in a story entirely devoted to travel; at the same time, the very few chapters devoted to them give the impression, through the necessity of condensation, of a hastily written journal. There is scarcely room to do justice to these pleasant and instructive scenes. The same thing may be said of the voyage of Captain Howe with his "shanghaied" crew—one of the most picturesque incidents in the book, but compressed into so few paragraphs as to be rather disappointing from an artistic point of view.

On the whole, the book is one calculated to give pleasure to all who read it, and impress upon them the beauty of an unassuming life of benefaction —

"The quiet wherein whitest charity,
That loves not noisy praise, elects to dwell."

This is an old-fashioned ideal, but one that will not be out of date while Christianity exists.

It is a book for the Sunday-school and for the home, and will doubt less furnish enjoyment and profit to many readers.

MARGARET R. SEEBACH.

NEWSON AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

A Modern English Grammar. By Huber Gray Buehler, English Master in Hotchkiss School.

This book is a modern and a model English grammar. The author has evidently profited by the innumerable experiments that have been made along this line. His method avoids on the one hand the dry dogmatism so long in vogue, which leaves nothing to the originality of the student, and on the other hand the equally dangerous "inductive" extreme, which assumes that the pupil's mind is sufficiently accurate and orderly to make its own generalizations. In the matter of method then the author seems to have profited by the wisdom of the past and the progress of the present and to have found the "golden mean."

The few pages of introduction are devoted to some interesting facts concerning the origin and make-up of the English language The treatment of the subject itself starts with the "sentence." While this idea is by no means unique, it is only recently that discussion has insisted upon it as the only rational order. This order recognizes the fact that while the average pupil uses the parts of speech with considerable ease and fluency, he has little practical acquaintance with the structure and relations of sentences. The compositions of college students even abundantly verify this fact.

The definitions and explanations are remarkably clear and simple and even the dullest boy should find them interesting. The illustrations are good and many of them. Instead of the conventional sentenses about the "dog" and "cat" and "little boy," they are drawn largely from the English classics and have fine literary quality in themselves.

The pupil who is thoroughly trained in this book should have not only a clear insight into formal grammar but a considerable acquaintance with many of the choicest quotations of our language.

The author has followed the method employed by him in his rhetoric in giving no sentences for correction, stress is laid on the oft-repeated use of correct forms rather than on the examination of incorrect forms of speech.

The rules of punctuation instead of being grouped by themselves at the end of the book, where they are either neglected entirely or studied out of relation to their uses are given in connection with the various topics. On the whole it is a sensible book having in it but little to criticise and many things to commend. C. H. HUBER.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

The Spiritual Life. Studies in the Science of Religion. By George A. Coe, Ph. D., John Evans Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in North-western University. pp. 279.

This volume will be found very instructive by those who are interested in the practical problems of the Christian life. The *raison d'etre* of the book is expressed by the author in his preface by saying that "a new intellectual attitude is necessary with respect to the facts of the spiritual life. The religious processes taking place around us and within us must be observed with all the precision that modern psychological methods and tools render possible."

To those who object to finding uniformities in religious experiences the author says: "Religion is at least a mass of ascertainable states of consciousness; and in the absence of information to the contrary we must presume that such states can be analyzed and described, and that their relations to one another and to the recognized laws of the mental and bodily life can be to some extent determined."

The book is an earnest protest against the unintelligent application of religion to the diversified needs of human nature. It claims, that which many acknowledge but few keep in mind, that temperament is a mighty factor in practical religion, and that religious workers are successful in proportion to their grasp of the temperamental peculiarities of those with whom they deal. In fact, the sub-title of the book might well be "A study of temperaments."

The table of contents will give a hint of Dr. Coe's method of treatment, and intimate some of the practical excellences of the book. It runs as follows: "The psychological point of view;" "A study of religious awakening;" "A study of some adolescent difficulties;" "A study of religious dynamics;" A study of divine healing;" "A study of spirituality. To this are added two appendixes of much suggestive and practical value—A. Questionnaire on religious experiences; B.

Plan for the observation of temperament. They will be found usefnl as they stand.

Those who read the book will not regret the time spent in the operation. They will find many new and valuable suggestions, and, to the majority, a new stand-point of religious observation and practical work, will be presented. JULIUS F. SEEBACH.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Schriftgemaesze und Erbauliche Erklaerung der Offenbarung St. Johannis. Von G Göszwein. 1900.

It is not the intention of the author to offer to the Church, in the above work a strictly exegetical commentary, nor to enter into an exhaustive and minute consideration of the figures and symbols of the Book of Revelation, but to offer to the general reader such helps and suggestions as will enable him to read this otherwise difficult book of the sacred canon with profit and with edification.

The author's *Introduction* covers some sixteen pages, and to our mind is the most interesting and scholarly part of the entire work. In it the subjects of authorship, authenticity and canonicity receive due consideration. Each of these subjects is treated in a lucid and scholarly manner. The citations from the Church-Fathers are extensive, and in the matter under consideration, exhaustive and conclusive.

The author fixes the date of the Apocalypse at 90–95, and urges as a reason for this the state of degeneracy into which the Church had already fallen; the fact that the Church was already persecuted, as a result of which persecution St. John was banished; and the conception of the Church as already divided into sections.

Chiliaism, the author thinks, has been read into the book rather than drawn from it. He emphasizes the thought that the "Revelation of Jesus Christ" is a bringing together, and an enlargement of all previous revelation, and hence all symbolical figures, and visions and conceptions of O. T. prophecies are continually reappearing in new conceptions, forms, and combinations in this book of the sacred canon. By being "in the spirit" we are reminded of Ezekiel 37 : 1, Daniel 10. The seven lamps as symbols of the seven churches find their prototype in the golden candlestick with its seven lamps, Ex 25 : 31, *et. seq.* The description of one "coming in the clouds;" of a girdle: of hair like wool; feet like brass; eyes of fire, point to the prophesies of Daniel. The Messianic pictures of Isaiah of the "root of David," "branch," "shoot," are here reproduced. The echo of primitive prophecy is heard in the "line of the tribes of Judah."

To prove the Johannean authorship of the Apocalypse the author relies chiefly on the internal evidences, claiming that the difference of style between this book and the Gospel of John must be accounted for by the difference of subject. Writing a revelation akin to, but more exalted than the O. T. prophets, John himself a Hebrew, reverts to

Hebraistic style. The resemblance in style between the Apocalypse and the Gospel is averted to, and a very ingenious argument deduced.

The usual division of the book into seven parts is presented, each part or division representing an epoch in the historical progress of Christ's kingdom on earth. It is claimed that the history of salvation, is to a great extent governed by numbers, but the reader is cautioned not to attempt too much in his endeavour to interpret their chronological significence. These numbers and figures should be studied reverently, and not to gratify curiosity.

It may be, that the conceded value of the *Introduction*, has led us to expect too much from the author's comments on the text. The later, we fear, the general reader will find somewhat disappointing. We readily admit that a writer on the apocalypse must be allowed some liberty in the interpretation of difficult passages, as long as he remains on safe evangelical ground, and we are loath therefore, to criticise harshly some peculiar interpretations of the author, but we are quite sure that he has shed no additional light on the text, and in numerous instances has beclouded the same with an unnecessary profusion of words and quaint-ideas Then again, the author detracts from the general value of his work by the employment of a style that to us seems too belligerent, denunciatory and uncharitable in a work of this kind. We have room but for a few specimens:

The Star, Chap. 9 : 1, "is the Pope." The locusts, 9 : 3, are the cardinals, bishops, prelates, priests, monks, nuns, etc.; lazy, devouring, who befoul (beschmeizen) that which is green and thriving; good for nothing but to coo, hum and whiz in others' ears, and their entire shaven cabal of choirasses can do nothing but bleat and howl for the belly-fodder (bauch-futter) in the pastures and meadows of their monasteries and cloisters.

The Prussian Union is "a trick of the old Serpent, hatched out by the Balaam-prophets of the king." p. 68.

"No heavenly prison—a fabrication of Calvin, contains the Son of Man, and no balloon (Luft-Schif) of the fanatics ascends up to him." p. 51.

"The union churches of our country fatten on the unclean apostates, who refuse the discipline of the Spirit in doctrine and life." p. 55.

But enough of this. We submit, this is not interpreting the Scriptures. Such language has no business in a book purporting to be a "Scriptural and Edifying" exposition of a portion of the Divine Word. Fulmination is not argumentation, and the above is but a sample of the "stock in trade" of a certain class of religious writers whose shade, we hope, for the good of the Church, and the glory of God, is becoming beautifully less.

R. H. CLARE.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

Notices of the *Atlantic Monthly* necessarily have a certain sameness

about them—there is always so much in this magazine to praise, so little to censure. The issue for October gives no reason to depart from our usual judgment. Its contents are such as we expect in the *Atlantic* —always of high character. *Apropos* of the recent events in China a very interesting and timely article appears on "The Crises in China," by James B. Angell, President of the University of Michigan. A discussion of "Our Immigrants and Ourselves," by Kate Holladay Claghorn suggests some strong facts as reasons for considering our general belief in the evil from immigration ill-founded. "John Ruskin as an Art Critic," "Some Old-Fashioned Doubts about New-Fashioned Education," "Finding the 1st Dynasty Kings," are among the leading articles of the month. The fiction of this number is worthy of separate mention. "The Draxon Dinners," by Charles Warren is a very artistic story; while Mary Hallock Foote in the second installment of "The Prodigal" successfully continues her treatment of a novel theme. Among the excellent poetry of the number, Paul Lawrence Dunbar contributes a short poem on "Robert Gould Shaw." Other numbers of interest and merit cannot be individually mentioned, but contain most profitable and delightful reading. The *Atlantic Monthly* in its October issue, well justifies the position it holds as distinctively a journal of culture.

TERMS—$2.50 a year, if paid in advance or within the year; otherwise, $3.00.

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

CONDUCTED BY

M. VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D. PHILIP M. BIKLÉ, PH. D.
JAMES W. RICHARD, D. D. THOMAS C. BILLHEIMER, D. D

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

PRES. S. A. ORT, D. D., LL. D. PROF. F. D. ALTMAN, D. D.
PROF. ALFRED HILLER, D. D. PROF. JACOB YUTZY, D. D.

VOL. XXX.—NO. 4.

OCTOBER, 1900.

GETTYSBURG:
THE J. E. WIBLE PRINTING HOUSE, CARLISLE STREET (SECOND SQUARE).
1900.

CONTENTS OF NO. IV.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

I. Higher Criticism, ... 453
By Rev. Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph. D.

II. Luther and the Augsburg Confession, . . . 463
By Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D.

III. A Chapter in Modern Christian Evidences, . 504
By Rev. C. F. Sanders, A. M.

IV. The Covenant People and their Part in the Promises, ... 518
By Rev. J. F. Pollock.

V. The Discouragements and Encouragements of a City Pastorate, ... 533
By Rev. F. M. Porch, D. D.

VI. Asceticism: Its Place in Christian Conduct, . 556
By Rev. G. U. Wenner, D. D.

VII. Jesus With the Doctors, ... 565
By Rev. R. B. Peery, Ph. D.

VIII. Current Theological Thought, ... 574
I. ENGLISH AND AMERICAN,
By Prof. David H. Bauslin, D. D.

II. GERMAN,
By Rev. S. Gring Hefelbower, A. M.

IX. Review of Recent Literature, ... 590
Ethics and Revelation—St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans—The Messages of the Apostles—Paul of Tarsus—Postmarked "Colima"—A Modern English Grammar—The Spiritual Life—Schriftgemaesze und Erbauliche Erklaerung der Offenbarung St. Johannis—Atlantic Monthly.

KEE MAR COLLEGE

AND

Music and Art Conservatory,

[CHARTERED 1850,]

Offers Classic, Normal, Music and Art courses for Diploma and Degrees; comprises three large brick buildings situated on a beautiful eminence, a lovely campus, library, apparatus, hot and cold mountain water, steam heat, gas light, electric bells, a suite of rooms nicely furnished for every two or three students, music lessons on Pipe-Organ, Reed Organ, Piano, Violin, Guitar, Mandolin, Banjo, and Cornet.

Lessons in Drawing, Crayoning, Pastel, Oil and China Painting.

German and French languages taught and spoken.

Special attention paid to Elocution and Voice Culture.

Normal course with Diploma for teaching.

Strict attention given to Physical, Social and Religious Culture.

Kee Mar College is located in a most attractive, refined and healthful city of 14,000 people.

Send for catalogue and journal to

REV. C. L. KEEDY, A. M., M. D., President,

HAGERSTOWN, MD.

---

50 YEARS' EXPERIENCE

PATENTS

TRADE MARKS
DESIGNS
COPYRIGHTS &C.

Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain our opinion free whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. Handbook on Patents sent free. Oldest agency for securing patents.

Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive *special notice*, without charge, in the

Scientific American.

A handsomely illustrated weekly. Largest circulation of any scientific journal. Terms, $3 a year; four months, $1. Sold by all newsdealers.

MUNN & Co. 361 Broadway, **New York**

Branch Office, 625 F St., Washington, D. C.

Theology of Luther

IN ITS

Historical Development and Inner Harmony.

BY DR. JULIUS KÖSTLIN.

TRANSLATED BY

REV. CHARLES E. HAY, A. M.

COMPLETE IN TWO VOLUMES.

12mo. Cloth, 1110 pages, $4.50.

At the meeting of the General Synod held at Mansfield, Ohio, the following was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That we call the special attention of the ministers and people of our Church to the issue of a translation of Köstlin's Theology of Luther by the Lutheran Publication House; that we commend the issue of this work as of immense importance to our Church; that we express as the sense of this body that this work should be in the hands of all our ministers, theological students, and many of our laymen, both for the value of the work and as an encouragement to the future issue of works of this character."

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

No. 1424 Arch Street,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.